SENATE RESPONSES TO STRATEGIC PLAN
APRIL 6, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

March 31, 2010

TO: Anthony Norman
        Chair, Riverside Division

FM: John Trumble
        Chair CAP

RE: **CAP response to the Academic Excellence section of the Strategic Plan**

We were somewhat surprised that the introduction did not mention the nationally ranked departments and Colleges at UCR. We are aware of several, such as Entomology and Natural Resources and Conservation (top 5 in the country), Botany and Plant Pathology and Microbiology (top 10), and the Department of Psychology and the College of Engineering (top third). Our Graduate School of Education was ranked the best of its size on the west coast. These rankings represent significant achievements that we feel should be acknowledged and promoted.

1. All means should be used to stimulate the grant productivity of the faculty.
We have no problem with trying to stimulate faculty to write grants. As noted in the document, this could be achieved by a number of actions, such as returning significant proportions of overhead to Departments and PIs. However, grants should not be made a mandatory requirement for merit advancement or promotion. We firmly believe that funding does not equal scholarship. There are many examples of major scientific advances made by individuals with views outside the mainstream that make getting grants difficult. Not all lack of funding is because ideas lack merit. In fact, the development of academic excellence follows upon quality, quantity and impact of scholarly productivity, not funding. Thus, faculty who are productive in scholarly activity should not be required to generate funding for advancement.

CAP does note that funding is already considered in the review process: those faculty with more funding tend to progress faster because they have more graduate students and post-doctoral researchers in their labs. Student and post-doctoral guidance are further rewarded in the advancement process as part of our teaching mission, so individuals with funding do benefit in several different ways. The suggestion that the CALL be amended to support grant activity is not necessary, as this is explicitly described as a positive factor in merit and promotion evaluations.

There are vast differences, in terms both of the necessity of external funding for high-quality research and in terms of funding opportunities, between different areas. Such differences are present, in fact, even within small units. Over-emphasis on funding would be unfair to researchers involved in more theoretical or less "fundable" research activities. Even if the rules are adjusted to take these differences into account, the university's merit and hiring priorities would eventually lead to migration of faculty to more "profitable" research topics, and eventual atrophy of some areas of research on the campus. Many of our large departments and other units that have become ranked for academic excellence have a continuum of research activities that range from very theoretical to very applied.

CAP agrees that campus procedures for dealing with non-collegial faculty who do not fulfill their obligations are inadequate.

2. Find ways to make grants easier to apply for and easier to administer.
We agree completely.

3. Create flexible forms of work assignment and merit evaluation that maximize the research and teaching potential of the faculty.
We certainly understand why this was suggested for consideration. On the surface this appears to be an efficient use of resources. However, CAP strongly disagrees with this approach. Creating a mechanism by which research is not required for advancement is a dangerous precedent. This path would not distinguish those of our faculty on a 'teaching track' from the Cal State Universities. In addition, the students that attend the University of California come to us because our faculty are actively involved in research. When our faculty teach they incorporate the latest information and research techniques in their lectures. Minimizing contact with research faculty (giving the well-funded researchers less teaching, or adding more teaching to the faculty not effective in research) would jeopardize a key aspect of the UC mission. Also, we can foresee a situation in which we would generate two classes of faculty: those who conduct research and those who are 'service' personnel responsible for teaching.

However, we do recognize that some faculty have stopped conducting research. CAP probably has a better perspective on this than almost any other academic group on campus. We suggest that those individuals that no longer have an active scholarly program be encouraged to move on or retire. We also note that many of those who are weak researchers are also weak teachers. Allowing such faculty to teach more would be a disservice to our students. If this policy is implemented, we strongly recommend that the absolute proportion of faculty allowed on this track never exceed 2% of the total faculty.

4. Review the activities of research centers on campus and sunset those that are no longer viable.
No comment

5. Develop an improved system for tracking and updating faculty awards.
Seems reasonable.

6. Secure nominations for top scientists for membership in the national academies.
Perhaps this should say 'scholars' rather than 'scientists' in an effort to recognize the value of such awards for all disciplines. We agree that asking our colleagues in such positions to consider supporting others from UCR is desirable.

7. Focus on creating a critical mass of faculty in selected areas, and
8. Find ways to reduce fragmentation caused by the proliferation of small units.
We suggest that historically effective or nationally recognized (ranked) departments or units should not be forced into this process unless the faculty in those departments wish to make changes.

9. Preserve currently strong departments and support productive faculty.
We strongly support this recommendation.

10. Identify strategic priority areas and focus investment on these areas.
Decisions on which areas to focus on should be arrived at by using external reviews of the individual disciplines to see which have the strongest core on which to build rather than making internal decisions that will inevitably be based on current academic fashion or the bias of those making the decisions.

11. Develop incentives to encourage academic leaders to participate actively in graduate education.
CAP considers involvement in graduate education to be an important, sometimes critical component in every file that is evaluated. Having and training graduate students is one of the rights of a faculty member at every level, and should not be removed except in very special circumstances.

12. Find ways to improve selectivity in undergraduate admissions, while maintaining the diversity of the undergraduate student body.
This is a reasonable goal.

13. Find ways to improve the undergraduate academic experience.
For those campus units that have an undergraduate program, consider approaches to allow more teaching credit to those that contribute significantly to undergraduate scholarship and research. In particular, those faculty who publish with undergraduates should be recognized. We note that the NSF, NIH, USDA and EPA all promote, if not require, the involvement of undergraduates (specifically under-represented minorities) on grants. This is an area where diversity, scholarship, productivity and funding could interact to benefit UCR. Strengthening the undergraduate honors program would also benefit the undergraduate academic experience.

We are aware that not all faculty have an opportunity to work with undergraduates, because not all departments have undergraduate programs. In some areas (mathematics, for example), there are few meaningful opportunities for undergraduate research because of the advanced nature of the material. These faculty should not be penalized.

14. Find ways to improve budget management and transparency.
Agreed.

April 5, 2010

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
        COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The Committee on Educational Policy discussed various aspects of the strategic planning documents during our regular meeting on March 12 and again in a special meeting on March 15. CEP had generally favorable views on some of the recommendations from the Excellence in Undergraduate Education Subcommittee. The recommendations on the "Ignition" seminars and the capstone research experience generated strongly mixed responses, however, and most of our discussion focused on these two items.

Ignition Seminars: Two CEP members participated in the Excellence in Undergraduate Education Subcommittee (EUES) and described these seminars as courses with standard academic content, but such that the format would stimulate the students to think with a broader view. For example, an ignition seminar on the topic of plant anatomy would stimulate students to consider questions such as "What is plant anatomy?", "Why study plant anatomy?", "What important questions need to be answered in plant anatomy?", and "What does it mean to learn plant anatomy?" Also considered would be issues such as "What do plant biologists do?", "What careers are available in plant biology?" and other related professional development aspects. The motivating concern is that many students arrive at UCR without having carefully thought about choice of a major and without a clear idea of what it really means to learn and to advance a discipline. Many are the first in their families to attend college, come from underprivileged backgrounds, and feel timid in the university environment. The role model of a Senate faculty member, showing in a small-class environment what it means to be a functioning intellectual working on real intellectual problems, could be invaluable to this kind of student.

Unfortunately, because the documents were written for "strategic vision", and not implementation, they do not clearly reflect this intention. For example, the statement "The topics of the seminars – chosen by faculty from their own specialties – would be

almost incidental to the more important task of turning students on to the life of the mind. What does it mean to read and write carefully, to formulate and solve problems, to think critically, and care about academic integrity? How does one take proper notes in class, study for exams, and plan for the future?" [page 13, EUES report], might suggest a kind of remedial course and actually have the effect of repelling students who do not want or need remedial work. CEP understands from its two members who were on the EUES that "remedial work" was not at all the intention of that subcommittee. CEP is unanimous that Ignition Seminars should not be remedial and would ask that EUES revise its document to make this clear.

More problematic are questions about the implementation of these seminars. Departments with very large undergraduate enrollments (Psychology, History, Biology, etc.) would find it hard or impossible to staff seminars. A seminar program might better begin with departments that have fewer undergraduates. There also should be no presumption that the seminars be "departmental." If one of the aims of the seminars is to open young minds to horizons that they may not have thought of (including different kinds of possible majors), there actually are advantages in having seminars that are not strictly departmental. A seminar offered by faculty in Comparative Literature, for example, might easily open intellectual doors to study in English, History, Media Studies, Hispanic Studies, Anthropology, and several other departments. Departments would have to decide on their own whether or not to grant credit for the work of a particular seminar.

These and other implementation questions need to be spelled out in careful detail. The role of college deans in administering teaching "loads," be they within departments or across departments, would seem to be indispensable. In particular, the possibility of assigning one ignition seminar every other year to all faculty is not easy to implement: in a department of, say, 24 faculty members; this would imply that every quarter 4 of the department's current courses would no longer be offered in current format. This would seriously disrupt the program and make it difficult for students (graduate and undergraduate) to graduate in a timely fashion; alternatively, this would limit the offering of service courses, which usually serve a large number of students, and would disrupt the workings of other departments and programs. In some instances, it might be essential that an ignition seminar substitute for a current course, but the implementation of this and other alternatives and options must be left to the purview of the departments and programs.

In page 25 of the EUES report, it is also states that "We recommend that our colleagues carefully assess low-enrollment upper-division courses with a view toward reducing and/or removing such courses in order to free up faculty time for use in larger-enrollment courses and the proposed Ignition seminars." This is another blanket recommendation that should not be adopted as part of a strategic plan: upper-division courses in some smaller programs are often low enrollment but are absolutely essential to training students in the major; eliminating low-enrollment upper division courses would eliminate the major itself in some cases

Capstone experience: As with the ignition seminars, the abstract idea behind requiring a capstone experience for all undergraduates is worthy, but the implementation would likely be feasible only for smaller programs. The prospect of requiring a capstone course for every student in majors with hundreds of students graduating every year is daunting. Unlike ignition seminars, capstone experiences do indeed need to be department-specific. Generating, supervising and evaluating individual (or perhaps small-group) projects in such programs is almost impossible with the current resources.

The drive towards AAU status: The "UCR 2020; The Path to Preeminence" (PTP) report emphasizes as a central goal that UCR should attain AAU status. This goal, when met, will clearly enhance the status of the campus will facilitate hiring top-notch faculty and will attract better students. Several member of the CEP considered, however, that this report does not present a balanced approach to achieving this goal. There is little discussion on the implications the process described will have for undergraduate education, and for disciplines which, by their very nature, would not bring significant amounts of extramural funding to the Campus. For example, in page 13 of this report section: "#2 Strengthening the Culture of Research and Scholarship" over-emphasizes funding over excellence in academic activities, and the discussion of "*Enriching Society through the Creative and Performing Arts"* as a strategic goal (page 15) is belied by several sections in this report as well as by its general tone. The CEP does not consider that the drive to achieve AAU status need require UCR to make draconian choices as institutions in this category usually present a balanced profile. We therefore urge that a more harmonious approach to achieving AAU status be presented and pursued.

Along this same line at the middle of page 4, the report suggests that the Call be amended to explicitly factor in proposal and grant activity. Are Calls at other UC campuses, such as UCB, UCSD, and UCLA, amended in this way? Such explicit amendment would magnify uneven expectations across disciplines that differ widely in availability of grant opportunities (medicine vs. history, for example). Further in the second paragraph on page 2 of Special Topics Paper #2: Faculty Appointments, there is a proposal that would essentially set up two classes of faculty-teachers and researchers. The expectation that all faculty should perform in three areas - research, teaching, and service - is well founded and should not be abandoned in an attempt to achieve AAU status. Indeed, most AAU institutions still value all three categories of performance.

Stating that (page 17) "Graduate education will be a central focus of the UCR campus, given priority for resources and – to the greatest extent possible – protected from cutbacks" suggests that undergraduate education will be considered a secondary goal. How are then the lofty thoughts contained in "Strategic Goal #3: Excellence in Undergraduate Education – A Great Start for a Strong Finish" (page 21) to be taken seriously?

The CEP understands that the documents presented are intended to provide new ideas that would allow us to better educate our students, but the plans need to be made considerably more concrete. However those plans might eventually look, the CEP considers it essential that campus-wide implementation not be attempted as the first step.

The more controversial programs, particularly ignition seminars and capstone courses, would best be implemented as pilot programs for smaller programs and for a limited subset of the majors in larger programs. These pilot implementations should include well-developed student learning outcomes and effective assessment mechanisms, as well as control groups, that will provide rigorous tests of the effect on student learning. Full expansion of ignition seminars and capstone courses beyond the pilot stage should be undertaken only if clear evidence exists that their value justifies what, at least in larger programs, will be their considerable cost.

Additional issues: There are also several other statements made in the documents that are of concern.

- Page 19, EUES report raises the possibility of including "student leadership and community engagement as admissions criteria," without emphasizing that these should not lower student quality. We suggest that before any "realignment" of the Academic Index Score is implemented that appropriate testing be performed to insure that any changes do not have unintended negative consequences.
- In page 8 of the PTP report, the paragraph "Committed Faculty, Staff, and Administrators" should be re-written. With a student population of 20,000 what exactly does "small campus feel" mean?
- The PTP report needs to be carefully proof-read for clarity, consistency and proper language.

UC RIVERSIDE | Academic Senate

APRIL 7, 2010

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: M. MARTINS-GREEN, CHAIR
        COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: RESPONSE TO THE UCR STRATEGIC PLANNING REPORT

We applaud the incredible energy and effort that has gone into this plan, not only from the administration but also from all of those who participated in it. The document reads extremely smoothly and provides a good vision but in our opinion it is lacking in what the faculty would like to see – which is prioritization and planning for funding of those priorities. Although we examined the whole plan, *our charge from the Senate Chair was to concentrate on reporting our views on Strategic Goal #4: The engaged University - Responding to Regional, State, National and Global Issues and Strategic Goal #5: Climate and community – Healthy, Welcoming and Respectful.* As a consequence we will comment only on these strategic goals.

Goal #4: *The engaged University - Responding to Regional, State, National and Global Issues*

UCR already has a number of engagements with the community that are being very successful (p. 27) but the report is proposing a number of others that are equally laudable and will further engage the University with the Community. The major comment we have on this portion of the strategic plan is that no University funds should be used for this endeavor. The resources provided by the University should be intellectual resources that will lead to acquisition of funds from the Federal or State Governments and the Private Sector. There are now increasing numbers of avenues to pursue such funding – especially linked to diversity. Similarly (p.28), UCR should not be investing its financial resources into providing opportunities for faculty and students to engage the community. Such funding is available externally and should be pursued much like research support is pursued by those in science and engineering.

In the report, it is commented that "UCR can make community engagement part of its 'DNA'". This is a very dangerous statement because it implies that the university and the community should be one. That would not be good because we bring to the table different strengths and obligations. The community and UCR are different entities that should be working together toward common goals for the region – ie. growth, sustainability and visibility.

It is also mentioned that the campus will take the lead in "creating a seamless educational experience for UC-eligible students from K-12 to graduation from UCR". Again, this is a laudable proposition but it could implies that our students come only from our immediate area because to create a seamless experience requires interaction. We believe that one of UCR's goals should be to become a campus of choice from throughout the state and even beyond. Having said this, the School of Education needs to put effort into engaging in these kinds of activities with the community. We do not see this as a high priority for the campus as a whole.

It is also said that UCR should expand collaborations with outside entities and strengthen its position amongst community leaders and that this will require "shared decision-making". The latter statement is troubling because, although UCR should be listening to and consulting stakeholders, such external groups should not participate in University decisions. Again, we and the community are not one entity. We should listen but we have different goals and aspirations albeit with a strong need to work together.

We applaud to give more credit in the merit/promotion process to those who engage the community in intellectual activities, so long as this is not part of the faculty member's academic program. That is, such credit is to be given as service beyond one's scholarly activities.

Finally, the "Criteria for Assessing Potential Engagement Programs" is generally excellent but, again, caution should be exercised when evaluating "campus-wide commitment". This could also bring about questions of academic freedom because the faculty has the freedom to choose their academic endeavors and should not be forced to engage in things that they don't feel interested in.

Goal #5: Climate and Community – Healthy, Welcoming and Respectful

If there is an aspect of strategic planning that deserves great attention, it is the climate on campus. In the last few years, a great deal has been done to improve the climate for undergraduates but that has come at a great price to the faculty, staff, and graduate students. It is time that we turn our attention and efforts to building this latter part of the University. The climate for the faculty is demoralizing and in many ways so overwhelming that it leads to a sense of hopelessness. In the last few years, the rapid growth of undergraduates, coupled with insufficient growth of faculty and staff, at least in the sciences, has led to a faculty that feels overworked and undervalued. One problem that is already apparent is withdrawal of many faculty from interest in campus matters – to focus on their own world of scholarship. This was clearly visible during the 6 April Strategic Planning forum; the attendance was very poor and the comments self-serving which indicates that the faculty are operating in survival mode.

What we think is necessary to turn this situation around?

1. Investment in faculty and staff. Key to solving this situation is to infuse money to hire faculty and staff strategically. There are units on campus that are very underfunded and lack appropriate support. A detailed study should be performed to identify the units with the greatest needs. Again, this should be done strategically. If support units and/or departments must be combined for fiscal reasons, attention must be paid to the consequences of those savings. Confining units with disparate needs can lead to disaster. On the other hand, if such consolidations are strategically done they can be successful. There already are examples of both of these outcomes on campus.

2. Investment in Faculty retreats. Departments and other academic units (e.g. graduate programs and research units) must be provided funds to hold planning retreats. This not only will help the faculty to focus but will also provide ways of networking that can lead to productive interactions. It seems that these days we spend our time running from one place to another trying to cope with the demands on us with no time to think about larger unit/campus issues.

3. Mentorship programs. Faculty mentorship programs have been proven to be effective in generating a sense of belonging of new faculty and caring by the Institution. This is another critical aspect. We understand that a part-time administrative position was created some time ago but we have not seen such a program underlined effectively put into place.

4. University Club. We must bring back a centrally-located place on campus for the University Club. The idea of the Club is still alive (including its liquor license), thanks to a dedicated small group of faculty and staff who have not allowed it to die. However, a room in the back of a restaurant (the Barn) does not constitute a University Club. To our knowledge, UCR is the only campus of UC that does not have such a club or center for Faculty and Staff except for the very young campus at Merced. It was hoped that the Alumni Center could fill that function. Experience has proven that not to be the case. We need a centrally-located place for faculty, graduate students, and staff akin to the HUB for undergrads. We realize that funds for a University Club cannot come from the State. However, we would like to see commitment from the Chancellor that University Advancement will help obtain us such funds.

5. Diversity and leadership of women and diverse faculty. CODEO is concerned with the lack of progress toward a more diverse faculty and graduate student body. We understand that this is not an easy endeavor and that in times of financial distress, opportunities to build diversity are limited. However, as financial constraints improve, it is imperative that we make strategic investments towards this goal. CODEO is also concerned that the efforts previously made to bring women and diverse faculty into positions of leadership is rapidly eroding. One only needs to look at the recent appointments to leadership positions. This problem must be addressed.

6. Potential administrative position. Last, but not least, the climate situation is so critical for any campus that the Administration should seriously consider investing significant resources in this aspect of the strategic planning. In particular, it is clear that the addition of an administrative position for undergraduate student support and well-being (VPUE) has been successful. We request that the Chancellor look at the possibility of either rearranging the duties of existing administrators or creating a new one in which the administrator focuses specifically on the climate and community aspects of this campus.

MARCH 30, 2010

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
          RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DAN HARE, CHAIR
          COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: CFW STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT RESPONSE

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) appreciates the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the first draft of the campus Strategic Plan and the two subcommittee reports on Campus Climate, and Community Engagement. In reviewing the documents, CFW determined that the Committee's concerns generally fell into one of five core issues, described below.

Core Issue # 1**: Shared Governance**. The Administration as well as the Senate should heed the Regents Standing order 105.2.b, which gives the Faculty full responsibility for all curricular matters. The Administration should refrain from using Administration-Faculty task forces to develop changes to the curriculum or attempt to impose a curriculum upon the faculty and ought instead to utilize the various Standing Committees of the Senate for such purposes.

> Standing Order 105.2.b: The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned.

Core Issue # 2: **The Call and the APM 210.** The Call merely describes how APM 210 is implemented on campus for review and promotion of faculty members. It is not a document for criteria for review and promotion of faculty members independent of APM 210. Therefore, it should be carefully noted that any changes to The Call must be consistent with APM 210.

Core Issue # 3: **Training and Compliance.** Faculty members are vexed by the current level of training and compliance and CFW is very concerned with the proliferation of different training programs. Faculty members are especially concerned about programs that are no more than obvious efforts to unload liability from the Administration onto the Faculty members, and with programs whose metric of success is the amount of time that faculty are forced to spend in training (and not the quantity of new, valuable information that might be transmitted). CFW

strongly suggests that any proposed training programs be carefully evaluated in terms of their expected benefits relative to the cost and time lost by faculty who are forced to participate in such programs.

Core Issue # 4: **Decentralized recovery of costs vs. broader goals of the campus and campus-community interactions.** Too many entities on campus seem to have their specific financial goals in mind at the expense of larger campus issues. Examples include the high cost of parking imposed on the non-campus community to attend campus-community functions, food service menus that conflict with the promotion of diversity, and the need to charge departments "rent" for rooms for functions, including outreach functions, whose attendance may be greater than can be accommodated by their departmental conference rooms and other departmental facilities.

Core Issue # 5: **Administrative support for Faculty grantsmanship**. In large part, the Strategic Plan depends upon individual faculty members funding their research through the direct costs from extramural grants, as well as a substantial portion of the rest of the University through the indirect costs from those grants. Most faculty members feel that the Office of Research Affairs has been more of a hindrance than a help in obtaining extramural support. If the Strategic Plan is to succeed then the Office of Research Affairs needs to adopt a completely new mindset and hire individuals with far different sets of skills than are currently available to faculty.

The Committee's concerns with specific recommendation are presented in detail below first for the Strategic Plan, then for each of the two subcommittee reports.

Responses to the Strategic Plan

1.   p. 6   Members question the utility of the H-index. The index has yet to be validated as a reliable metric of the quality of an individual faculty member so far as anyone on the committee knows. The biases and limitations of such scalar measures are poorly understood, especially when comparing across disciplines with far different numbers of active researchers.

2.   p. 12   Committee members are concerned that the incentive of reduced teaching to encourage grantsmanship may have negative impacts on the quality of teaching. Moreover, the reduced teaching for some must be made up by increased teaching by others. Such a procedure likely will become divisive and lead to an overall decline in the quality of instruction on the campus as a whole.

3.   p. 13   Throughout the plan, there is an implicit presumption that the goal of applying for a grant is the grant itself. Although this may be true from the viewpoint of the Administration, which seeks far higher levels of indirect cost return, the intellectual goal of the grant is to facilitate the research that the grant supports. CFW recommends caution in utilizing grant awards *per se* as an index of scholarly distinction and recommends that a truer index of such distinction be the quality and significance of the research findings funded by the grant.

4.   p. 14   CFW agrees that there are problems between department-based and interdepartmental graduate programs. Rather than having the Chancellor appoint a task force to examine alternate models of graduate programs and their financial support, CFW recommends that the Chancellor simply call upon the existing Graduate Council to carry out this task (See Core Issue # 1 above).

5.   p. 15   CFW strongly supports the reorganization and re-tasking of the Office of Research. This office must do more than endlessly forward requests for proposals and sidetrack the process of proposal submission in the name of compliance. More valuable would be staff members who have at their fingertips such information as the average grant size for different programs, what the funding trends are, and what the success rate is on a program-by-program basis for the programs of most utility to the departments and centers to which those staff members are assigned to support (See Core Issue # 5).

6.   p. 16   CFW believes that research space is at a premium on campus, and questions whether the goal of "cluster hires" is viable without new research space to place those new clusters of faculty. The construction of appropriate research and teaching space on this campus has always lagged the recruitment of both students and faculty, and the model of cluster hires may not be feasible without substantially more construction of research facilities over the next ten years. One may argue that the clusters of research laboratories to house the clusters of faculty to be hired in 2015 should be well into the planning stages in 2010. The fact that construction on campus has not kept pace with demand for classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities is recognized on page 36 of the plan and that limitation should be given more consideration on the faculty hiring plans outlined on page 16.

7.   p. 20   Given the current seven-year cycle to evaluate graduate programs currently, CFW is at a loss to identify the appropriate staff resources to conduct annual reviews of graduate programs. To what depth can these annual reviews be taken and will they be cost-effective?

8.   p. 23   Although CFW supports the goal of more quickly integrating freshmen and transfer students into the UCR community, committee members questioned whether the 'ignition seminars' would be successful. In the first place, four units of credit may be too much for such a seminar, taking into account what can be accomplished through the two-unit Freshman Discovery Seminars, and the Freshman Advising Seminars offered by CNAS. Secondly, it must be recognized that different faculty members have different teaching skills and expertise, and not all faculty members should be expected to be equally successful in the proposed format. Finally, some members of CFW wondered if the objective of making this type of seminar a standard part of teaching responsibilities for Senate faculty is in conflict with the proposal to grant teaching relief in exchange for successful grantsmanship (p. 12). This aspect of the curriculum is one that should originate from the Senate and not the Administration (See Core Issue # 1).

9.   p. 29   "In the faculty merit and promotion process, incorporation of community engagement into scholarly activities or the curriculum will be viewed as positive evidence of service." It is far from apparent that such considerations are mandated by the

APM. Such questions must be referred to CAP, rather than being decided by the Task Force or the administration (See Core Issue # 2).

10   p. 33   CFW would appreciate some clarification of the following sentence in Action # 5. "Any evidence of concern – particularly those incidents that threaten UCR's Principles of Community will be immediately investigated and addressed." Will this be addressed by existing entities, such as the Ombudsman, the Office of Student Conduct, the Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure and the like, or is some new, additional office envisioned?

Response to Campus Climate Subcommittee Report.

11.   pp. 3 and 10   CFW does not support hiring a new high-ranking administrator for campus climate. CFW believes that this position will be wholly ineffective unless this individual has significant monetary resources (presently unidentified) to reward or to withhold in order to achieve his or her charge. Some committee members are concerned that such a hiring likely would be ridiculed outside the University as a continuing illustration of insensitivity by the University to the proliferation of highly-paid administrators.

12.   p. 4   CFW endorses the recommendation to "Refocus Parking Services' mission." CFW believes that the high cost of after-hours parking works at cross purposes in promoting additional engagement with the community. The campus administration should reconsider whether this form of decentralized cost recovery is consistent with the goal of enhancing engagement with the community (Core Issue # 4).

13.   p. 5   Training of new faculty in staff and student supervision and relations. CFW believes that this is something that new faculty members should have learned as graduate students and postdocs and therefore questions the benefits of this new training relative to the time that it would take (see Core Issue # 3). Some on the committee perceive that faculty members would view such training as inspiring contempt for the very procedures for which they are intended to promote respect.

14.   p. 5   Ending the exceptions for the Mortgage Orientation Program for faculty living outside the standard commuting range…" CFW sees this as a punitive measure to constrain faculty members to live close to campus regardless of their desires. CFW would rather see this goal achieved through incentives rather than punitive measures. More than 40% of responding faculty members in the Faculty Climate Survey were "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied with career opportunities for their partners /spouses, and the proposed policy would be detrimental to faculty members who needed to live half-way between the campus and their spouse's place of employment within the greater Los Angeles area. CFW is concerned that the proposed policy could have unintended consequences on faculty recruiting and is concerned that special-case exemptions will detrimentally affect faculty morale.

15.   p. 6   CFW opposes additional faculty training for search committee members and chairs (See Core Issue # 3). Well-intentioned programs advocating greater faculty and

administration sensitivity to diversity in hiring have been promoted for the past forty years with varying degrees of success. Most have come down to requiring that the hiring department have the most diverse pool of candidates obtainable. Administration monitoring of this is not new. Rather than invest in additional training of faculty members (which they may utilize only once or twice over their careers), it may be more cost-effective to engage professional recruiting firms to assemble candidate pools. CFW sees such mandatory training as providing a significant disincentive toward serving on search committees and having significant negative impacts on campus morale.

16.   p. 6   CFW would consider supporting the *availability* of training opportunities for faculty in staff/student relations and diversity on an optional basis, for each faculty member to decide whether or not to take. CFW strongly opposes any such *mandatory* training without an appropriate cost-benefit analysis (see Core Issue # 3) and a Senate vote on the issue at a Division meeting.

17.   p. 10   CFW would need to see the details of what a "Campus Climate Impact Statement" would require before taking a positive position on this recommendation. In a lean financial climate, CFW is generally concerned with enforcing any trade-offs between research infrastructure and Campus Climate Factors in the design of new buildings. Most buildings first come in substantially over-budget, and the "Value Engineering" process (e.g., cost-cutting) often is severe in order to get as much of the original functionality into the final design. We therefore question how many Campus Climate Factors would survive Value Engineering, and therefore how effective the first three recommendations on this page can be.

Community Engagement Committee

CFW found little that was objectionable in this report, even as we found the report vague in terms of what should be changed. The diverse nature of the faculty's work implies that its community engagement will be diverse. We understand that a state university risks isolation from the broader community at its peril. Since its founding in the land grant and agricultural and mechanical college traditions, the University of California has embraced the practical dimension of university work as part of its mission, and its faculty has understood that this tradition has a public and community dimension. Sometimes service and engagement with the community is in direct response to a critical need, as was the case a decade ago when the Temecula wine industry was threatened by the glassy-winged sharpshooter. Sometimes it involves direct cooperation with local schools and community colleges in improving access to higher education. Sometimes it involves direct interaction with the community in the area of the fine arts. The Committee believes that UCR, rather than appearing defensive, has been exemplary in its work with and service to the broader community. Faculty members have been generous in responding to specific community and administration requests for research solutions to problems and speaking to community groups. Given the faculty's core responsibility for teaching and research, as well as understanding that university, professional, and public service are also parts of their job description, we believe it appropriate that the administration take the lead in representing the University's public interface with community groups in areas that are not specific to the particular work of a department or program.

In promoting additional engagement with the community, CFW wonders if such a goal is facilitated by charging high fees for parking for campus events open to the public. This is especially of concern for events held after normal hours of instruction when the parking lots are little-used. The campus administration should reconsider whether this form of decentralized cost recovery is consistent with the goal of enhancing engagement with the community (Core Issue # 4).

April13, 2010   **SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE**

Dear Anthony Norman:
Chair, Academic Senate

The first draft of the report "UCR 2020: The Path to Preeminence" says that our campus should have state-of-the-art facilities, including libraries. If this is UCR's goal, we have a long way to go. In 2007 the library spent $1,300,000 on print books. This year, due to budget reductions, the library has allocated only $375,000 on books. This represents a 70% cut! During the same period, the budget for monograph series was slashed from $250,000 to $100,000. The library cancelled $100,000 worth of databases. Student personnel for shelving books has been cut by nearly 50%.

The road ahead will be hard. Access to information is the life blood of a quality campus that aspires to rank in the top 25 of public research universities and to become a member of AAU. But in the years to come, the library estimates that books will increase in cost by 3-4% each year, and databases, electronic resources and journals by about 8-9% annually. Unless sufficient funding is restored, the library will be unable to support research, instruction, and the growth of the campus.

The physical infrastructure of the library is also critically strained. Most of the stacks in Rivera are over 90% filled to capacity. Research collections in the humanities and social sciences need to be kept on site to support faculty research and graduate education. No solution to this problem is in sight unless the University can raise funds to address this issue through expansion and/or renovation.

In short, the library is in deep trouble, which will only get worse unless the University includes the library among its top academic and infrastructure priorities.

The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Resources, Budget, Planning and Infrastructure have drafted a set of principles as part of the Strategic Plan. Overall these principles seem valid and useful. It is unfortunate that the subcommittee "did not have time" to formulate recommendations concerning a list of important issues including the Palm Desert campus, the ever-rising administrative salaries and number of administrators, and so on. We hope these are addressed in a later draft. When it comes to the library, the report correctly states:

"Finding effective and innovative ways to resolve library funding base and research

support issues are essential to advancing UCR's national reputation/ranking to a top 25 public research university and to achieving AAU status."

However, the report gives little sense of the magnitude of these issues. As the Strategic Plan moves forward, we urge the University to:

1) Acknowledge that we cannot achieve preeminence with an underfunded library that is forced to allocate more and more of its limited funds on increasingly expensive e-journals. Any realistic plan will involve restoring the library's base budget to levels comparable to those of 2007, at the very least, with inclusion of an element for inflation and support for growth of campus academic and research programs.

2) Compare our library's funding base to those of American Association of University (AAU) peer institutions with the same seriousness that it compares academic departments and investments in research.

3) Discuss the role and importance of the library in each of the reports of the 7 Task Forces. We were disturbed that only one of the Task Force reports addressed the library and its impact on the quality of UCR, namely that of the Subcommittee on Resources, Budget, Planning and Infrastructure. There is not one single Task Force report that can be implemented successfully without the involvement and support of excellent library resources and services. This is particularly true for excellence in research, graduate education, and undergraduate education.

4) Participate in the long-term UC drive for faculty to retain copyright ownership of their journal articles so that they may be deposited in the UC institutional repository. This is one way we can support the development of Open Access.   Open Access is an important long-term strategy for reducing the high cost of scholarly journals.

Sincerely,
John Baez

Chair, The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications

April 2, 2010

TO: Anthony Norman
               Chair, Riverside Division

FM: Carol J. Lovatt
               Chair, UCR Academic Senate Planning and Budget

RE: **Campus Strategic Plan - Draft #1**

The Planning and Budget Committee prefaces its review of Draft #1 of the Campus Strategic Plan, "UCR 2020: The Path to Preeminence", by expressing its appreciation to the campus Administration for the opportunity to provide feedback at this early stage in the development of the plan. We also acknowledge the considerable efforts of faculty and administrators that have gone into writing this first draft under the pressure of severe time constraints.

In the opinion of the members of Planning and Budget, Draft #1 of the Campus Strategic Plan is more a vision statement that summarizes the campuses aspirations than a strategic plan. The aspirations are meritorious and typical of what one would expect from a university striving to be a member of the AAU. Passages highlighting UCR's unique strengths and contributions to its students, UC system, and Inland Empire were, at times, obscured by flowery language and empty rhetoric. We suggest that this document be revised into a succinct (5- to 10-page) statement of the campus' vision of becoming an AAU institution and the specific goals the campus proposes to meet in order to achieve this vision by 2020. The goals should be as unique as UCR and grounded in the reality of the current and projected five-year State budget shortfall with a clearly defined vision of what we can achieve over the next five years and when the economy recovers. The "Mission, Vision and Goals of the University of California, Riverside" provided in Appendix A (page 42) is an excellent starting point. The campus desires a vision statement of which it can be proud – one it is willing to share with the public and use for student and faculty recruitment and University Advancement.

Planning and Budget members had specific comments regarding the following items in the plan.

- The draft misses excellent opportunities to document UCR's contributions to its students, the UC system, Inland Empire and the State. On page 7, it is reported that in 2009 Washington monthly ranked UCR 16th in the nation for contributing to the public good. What does this mean? Why is it significant? On page 7, reference is made to UCR being designated a Hispanic-serving Institution. What

does this mean for our students? On page 7, the section on diversity reports that racial and ethnic gaps in graduation rates are among the smallest in the nation but fails to place this in the important context of overall graduation rates. According to the Report of the Subcommittee *on Excellence in Delivery of Undergraduate Education*, the six-year graduation rate at doctoral granting institutions with over 40% of students on federal aid was 48%, whereas UCR's six year graduation rate was 64.7% for the entire 2002 entering class. This section also fails to inform about greater access and the extensive preparatory education provided to students by UCR. How many students has UCR graduated since opening its doors? How many Hispanic students and other underrepresented minorities relative to comparison universities?

- On page 9, it is stated that UCR had a $1.1B economic impact in California. In what way? It is also stated that UCR is the second largest employer in the city of Riverside and the 10th largest in the region. How many people? How many millions of dollars in salaries and benefits? This is an excellent opportunity to summarize the financial contributions that UCR's SOM will make to the area.

- Many strategic goals and action items are unrealistic given current and projected campus resources, budget and infrastructure. P&B believes that the campus is not well served by stating aspirations that are beyond our resources without also identifying achievable milestones. To do so will create a sense of hopelessness rather than the opportunity to celebrate progress. Two examples of aspirations that will be difficult to achieve with the current limited number of faculty (FTE) and projected hires over the next five years are provided to illustrate the point: (*i*) Strategic Goal #2, Action #2: Growing Graduate Enrollment, which states – "To achieve the profile of an AAU institution, UCR will increase the proportion of graduate students to 18-20 percent of the total students;" and (*ii*) Strategic Goal #3, Action #4: Providing a Capstone Experience, which states – "UCR will offer every undergraduate student the opportunity to complete a capstone experience, in the form of a design project, senior thesis, creative activity, or equivalent." Aspirations for the campus need to be recast as final goals for UCR 2020 with proposed realistic milestones that we can achieve in the near term and beyond.

- The Palm Desert Campus, which is mentioned in the following statement "*Special consideration will also be given to the future of UCR's Palm Desert Graduate Center, which currently offers an MFA and an Executive MBA*" (Goal #2, Action #2) is a subject of special concern to the members of Planning and Budget. Both P&B's April 10 2009 Recommendations to the Chancellor on the Budget Crisis and P&B-BAC's April 12 2009 Subcommittee Report urged a cost: benefit analysis of the Palm Desert Campus. Before steps are taken to expand programs at Palm Desert, we again urge the Administration to evaluate first, whether the $1.8M spent annually on this unit would provide greater benefits if redirected elsewhere, especially in light of current and anticipated levels of funding over the next five years, and second, whether the UCR campus can realistically develop a

strategy for making this unit self-supporting. The Palm Desert campus has not become a focal point for development efforts as originally envisioned. Moreover, it is proving difficult to increase faculty numbers on the campus; it is simply too far for faculty to commute. P&B recommends that we rent enough space to cover the costs of maintaining the campus in an attempt to sustain it through these difficult economic times *only if* we plan to keep it. There is a strong consensus among the members of P&B that we are wasting both time and money on the Palm Desert campus that could be better used on the main campus.

- It is clear that the School of Medicine (SOM) plays a major role in how the campus envisions achieving AAU status, yet the SOM is mentioned only in passing on pages 6 and 7, and on page 36 with assurances that this "key initiative" will not impinge "on the goals of other campus needs"(*sic*). Only in Appendix A on page 42 is establishment of the SOM clearly identified as one of the campus' 13 Vision and Goals. Members of P&B believe it disingenuous not to include the SOM in the campus plan for UCR 2020. The SOM has a founding Dean; campus faculty members have been displaced to house the SOM Dean and his staff; and a new building is under construction for the SOM. The SOM already has had and will continue to have a significant impact on the campus plan and strategic planning process. Strategic Goal #7 – Resources, Budget, Planning and Infrastructure: A Strategic Transparent Approach – cannot be a reality and assurances of transparency will continue to ring hollow if the future development of the SOM is not specifically addressed in Draft #2 of the Strategic Plan (as outlined below).

Members of Planning and Budget eagerly await the "set of working documents" mentioned on pages 10 and 40 as "currently under development". We envision that these documents will contain the information we expected to see in the Strategic Plan: (1) the specific goals to be met in achieving the campus vision, along with a time line for each goal that identifies the milestones to be accomplished in working toward each goal; (2) the resource and infrastructure needs and estimated costs associated with each milestone and the total cost of each final goal; and (3) identification of available and future funding sources for each goal and its milestones. An adequate strategic plan timeline must include several scenarios based on more or less "rosy" economic forecasts and must extend for at least the next five years.

For example, we expect the working documents to address the question of the size and shape of the campus. We read that the graduate student body will be 18-20% of the total number of students at UCR by 2020. At what rate will total enrollment grow? What measurable milestones will mark concrete progress towards our aspirational goals? Academic quality of our students? Number of non-resident students? As a campus, will we continue to over-enroll students beyond the number supported by state funds? What are the projections for faculty, TA and RA growth?

P&B emphasizes the critical need for campus planning to make realistic estimates of costs and resources necessary to preserve the quality of what we have achieved to date. We should not let our aspirations for reaching optimistic future goals undermine the quality of current attainments.

Planning and Budget was also charged with reviewing the reports of two strategic planning subcommittees: (1) *Resources, Budget Planning and Infrastructure* and (2) *Advancement*. Committee members felt that the reports of both subcommittees had been compromised by the fact that the subcommittees had been called upon to complete their reports before the strategic plan was even in draft form. With the development of the type of strategic plan P&B outlined above, the *Resources, Budget Planning and Infrastructure* and *Advancement* Subcommittees can begin their real work. We suggest a combined effort coordinated by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

The *Resources, Budget Planning and Infrastructure Report* proposes that all campus planning and resource allocation decisions should be based on the Strategic Plan. Further, to facilitate implementation of the plan, the report proposes that each organizational unit (OU) develop a set of goals, milestones, metrics and benchmarks aligned with the plan and that a Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee (SPCC) be established to review the OU plans and advise on strategic plan implementation and resource allocation. It was proposed that the SPCC review all OUs semi-annually. Most members of P&B felt that semi-annual review was too frequent and questioned whether existing mechanisms for reviewing unit plans could be modified to also assess a unit's contribution to the strategic plan. The subcommittee also made suggestions for facilitating budget transparency and urged redoubling of efforts to increase federal funding, indirect cost recovery and university advancement, while achieving greater administrative efficiencies and minimizing time spent on compliance and risk management. The subcommittee urged the campus to pay special attention to the cost and management of the undergraduate academic enterprise and to decisions related to capital planning, deferred maintenance and facilities upgrades. The report of this subcommittee did not identify new strategies for funding UCR's vision.

The *Advancement Report* summarized the status of philanthropy in the current economic climate in the US and opportunities for UCR. It is clear the University Advancement Office is going to be called upon to generate a larger proportion of UCR's budget than it has succeeded in providing in the past and that the Office recognized the increased importance of its role to the campus. The report of this subcommittee did not identify new strategies for increasing philanthropy to support UCR 2020.

March 31, 2010

TO:
    A. Norman, Chair, Riverside Division

FROM:
J. Ganim, Chair, Committee on Physical Resource Planning

RE:

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANNING REPORT, *DRAFT #1*, BY SENATE COMMITTEES

The Committee on Physical Resource Planning was asked to respond to the report of the "Resources" subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Process. Because that report focused largely on budgetary considerations, we also reviewed the other subcommittee reports that comment on physical resources.

I. COORDINATION OF PHYSICAL PLANS WITH STRATEGIC PLANS

As it turns out, relatively few sections of any reports address physical resources, design, physical planning and infrastructure. The reason for this omission is because the campus already has long range plans parallel to the strategic planning process in place. Our primary suggestion is that the final report contain a brief mention and link to these documents.

The campus master plan can be found at:

http://apb.ucr.edu/cap_plan/CAMPS.pdf

The long range development plan (which is subject to constant modification) can be found at:

http://lrdp.ucr.edu/LRDP05-Oct2005.pdf

The excellent campus design guidelines can be found at:

http://apb.ucr.edu/cap_plan/files/documents/campus%20design%20guidelines.pdf

Obviously the long range plans will be subject to updating pending the outcome of the Strategic Planning Process.

II. RESEARCH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Of course, we agree with the action item proposed by the "Research" subcommittee:

"Action #5: Building the Research Infrastructure – For UC Riverside to achieve the profile of an AAU member, the campus must continue to enhance its research infrastructure. This includes ensuring that the campus has state-of-the-art facilities and equipment, including everything from performance studios to laboratories, from greenhouses to information technology, from libraries to instrumentation. Faculty will be encouraged to seek federal funding to help build this infrastructure, particularly as it supports centers and special programs. To the extent possible, fundraising will assist in generating the resources necessary to build the research infrastructure."

Here and elsewhere in all of the reports, the campus is being asked to seek outside funding for items that formerly were covered by state funding and no longer are to the extent they were in the past, notably equipment and interior amenities. At the same time, we are concerned that the slow recovery of the Riverside area from the economic downturn and the implosion of those sectors of the economy that have traditionally provided the sources of private wealth in the area will make the pursuit of supplementary funding even more of a challenge over the next decade than it has been in the past decade, the optimistic tone of the SPP report notwithstanding.

Several other reports note that renovations and deferred maintenance hinder not only research productivity but also collaboration. As the "Research" report suggests: "Often a good collaboration can be hindered by something as simple as laboratories in different buildings. Right now, some of the existing departments have been moved to new buildings while others remain in old ones. When this was done at UCB, two new buildings were constructed. It's hard to imagine how it would work without some major building renovations." A concern with the pace of deferred maintenance is noted elsewhere. At the least, the appropriate campus bodies should probably update their web sites relating to deferred maintenance timelines and procedures. We applaud the "Resources, Budget and Planning" subcommittee report for its suggestions about deferred maintenance.

Several observations were made about the age of campus facilities. As one report notes, "any of UCR's research buildings are four to five decades old and not suitably equipped for 21_{st} century science." Actually, the age of buildings do not always determine their adaptability to new research uses. Even a relatively recent building could be so tightly programmed that its use for other purposes would be limited. We would suggest that whenever possible, that the future use and adaptability of new structures be considered as part of the DPP (Detailed Planning and Programming) process.

III. DESIGN, AESTHETICS AND CAMPUS ATMOSPHERE

We concur with the general principles enunciated in the "Climate" subcommittee report, especially its emphasis on sustainable design and socially interactive and welcoming spaces and places. Some of its suggestions, such as an "archway or some form of statuary to provide an inviting entrance to the campus that also creates a clear physical divide between campus and community" are probably not the best way to accomplish these goals, especially since the campus will be spreading west at a rapid pace.

A number of responsible campus bodies, including the campus Design Review Board and its outside consultants, are deeply concerned with such issues. We note, however, that both sustainability and programmed gathering spaces are extremely expensive in the short run, even if economical in the long run, and often are compromised as buildings and landscaping are subject to mandated value engineering. Until the value engineering process mandated by the state takes into account sustainable building practices, we are likely to continue to build projects that will seem wasteful in future years. Other campuses, such as San Diego and Santa Barbara have been more successful with green projects, though their location and climate is an advantage. So has Davis, however.

Indeed, from the point of view of design in general, the past fifteen years in the growth of UCR have been a historic opportunity, but the results have been inconsistent, possibly because of a previously arbitrary policy of architect selection. An irony of the present bleak budget climate is the office of Design and Construction is now the most competent in the recent memory of the campus and the Campus Design Review Board is now fully operational. A possible suggestion would be to imitate the federal General Services Administration (GSA) Excellence in Architecture program for appropriate campus buildings in the future. Creating a new campus officer responsible for "Campus Climate" is not a good idea. Empowering present administrators to take on that role is a good idea.

The "Climate" report bemoans the generally suburban and commuter nature of the campus, noting that it is a negative factor particularly for graduate student life. We would like to think that the many incremental changes offered by new dining and entertainment facilities and the growth of the campus will help to make the campus experience less like a business park experience, but it will be an uphill climb. The freeway bisecting a fully grown campus and the placement of University Village are barriers to a suturing of the campus to the urban fabric of the city. The looming redevelopment of Crest married student housing will result in the loss of one of the amenities on campus most cherished by graduate students.   Indeed, the success of Artsblock as an extension of the university suggests that there might be other ways of thinking of the campus climate experience than a traditionally centered model.

IV. INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES

We found most of the reports relatively silent on the shortage of classroom space on campus.

TO: Anthony Norman, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Richard Arnott, Chair, Committee on Research

RE: Opinion on Draft 1 of **UCR2020: The Path to Preeminence** and
               the Subcommittee Report on Excellence in Research and Creative Activity
               (ERCA Report)

DATE: March 30, 2010

The Committee was asked to comment on the first draft of the Strategic Plan, the
Subcommittee Report on Excellence in Research and Creative Activity, and also the
extent to which the Subcommittee's recommendations were incorporated in to first draft
of the Strategic Plan.

Given the limited time, it was decided that individual Committee members would write
individual reports, each raising one to three points, and that the chairman would write an
overview report, summarizing the individual reports and raising some broader issues.
The chairman's report is below. The individual reports are in an accompanying
attachment. Identifying information has been removed.

In its introduction, the Strategic Plan states: "UC Riverside aspires to stand among the
nation's top tier of public research universities, as recognized by the Association of
American Universities (AAU). --- [During] the last two decades, --- UC Riverside has
gained a national and international reputation for achieving excellence with diversity."
There is considerable disagreement on campus about how much priority should be
accorded to achieving AAU membership, as well as what is required to do so. There is
considerably less disagreement over the goal of "excellence with diversity"; it is not
inconsistent with the goal of AAU membership and recognizes the potential for the
university to achieve its own, distinctive personality.

Section 1 of the ERCA report examines what would be required to meet AAU standards
in terms of funding per faculty member and graduate student enrollment. With little
justification, the Report contentiously advocates doing what is necessary to meet these
standards by the year 2020 – recruiting 170 faculty members with a high funding profile
and increasing doctoral student enrolment by 1500. Since strategic plans are visionary

documents, they do not recognize mundane budget constraints. Nevertheless, even in the most reasonably optimistic budgetary scenario, achieving these goals would require a massive reallocation of resources across the university, to those areas of sciences and engineering that receive large amounts of federal research funds at the expense of other units on campus, to graduate education at the expense of undergraduate education, and to research at the expense of teaching. The Strategic Plan is more consensual in its recommendations and language. Nevertheless, like the ERCA report, it both endorses the goal of AAU membership and making that goal operational in terms of meeting the "Phase I indicators" (competitively funded federal research support, membership in the national academies, national research council quality ratings, faculty arts and humanities awards, fellowships, and memberships, and citations), which are biased towards those fields of science and engineering that receive large amounts of federal research funds.

Section 3 of the ERCA Report presents "Potential University-Wide Research Themes" in the context of "cluster hiring". There are potential advantages to cluster hiring. In some branches of science and engineering, major pieces of capital equipment are needed to undertake frontier research – an observatory is an example – and many of these cannot be cost-justified to support the research of only one or two faculty members; interdisciplinary research, especially across schools, is facilitated by more centralized hiring; and there may indeed be creative synergies from having researchers with overlapping interests and complementary abilities. But cluster hiring is more appropriate in the sciences and engineering, where research tends to be done in large teams, than in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, where most research is done solo or duo, with little capital equipment   As well, it is crucial that the cluster themes be appropriately chosen. They should be chosen based on metrics of excellence, recognizing that these metrics vary across disciplines, and should be updated periodically to reflect the shifting sands of creativity. Choosing themes that are trendy but in which the university has no particular expertise is counterproductive.

Most of the recommendations of Section 2 of the ERCA Report, on "Stimulation of an Enhanced Research Culture", and of Section 4, on "Management of the Research Enterprise", are sound and sensible. The Report says disappointingly little above creative activity in the arts, and is silent on the importance of an excellent library system.

The Report stresses the importance of providing incentives for faculty members to work harder to acquire extramural research funding. This principle is sound, but its application needs to recognize that the average level of extramural funding varies significantly across and also within disciplines. It is also important that incentives be dynamic (rewards for receiving extramural funding should be temporary rather than permanent) and that they not draw effort away from the other two pillars of faculty achievement, teaching and service.

Overall, the Committee felt that the Report placed excessive emphasis on two metrics of success of the research enterprise. This excessive emphasis would lead to unbalanced growth, favoring the big-money branches of science and engineering, and at the cost of

demoralizing faculty members in other areas. While the theme was more muted in the Report, and mixed with other themes, it was still there.

Since UCR is a research university, it is appropriate that research be given center stage in a strategic plan. Nevertheless, building a successful university requires fostering a sense of community, which requires balance and equity as well. Furthermore, if UCR is to achieve international or even national prominence as a university, it will not be solely on the basis of its research. UCR's potential claim to fame is as the most diverse of the research universities, and perhaps as well as a research university that is singularly committed to its regional community.

APPENDIX

Individual Committee Member Comments

on the
First Draft of the Strategic Plan
and the
Report of the Subcommittee on Excellence in Research and Creative Activity

****
I find these two documents to have very different takes on a strategic plan for UCR. One appears "soft" and the other appears "hard". The hard document, amongst other things, recommends a diversion of support from the Arts and Humanities to Science and Engineering. The soft document proposes on going support for both. Since the committee for the hard document was composed of a majority of faculty from Science and Engineering, this isn't surprising but it is disconcerting. The imbalance of representation on the committee is very worrisome.

I also have many questions concerning the obsession with future membership in the AAU. My questions are:

1.   Why? What will it get us? Will it come with all sorts of constraints?
2.   Are the numbers correct? How much will it really cost to go down this road? Does this document completely ignore the realities of the current economic crisis?
3.   And if it really is to our benefit to join the AAU, where in the AAU guidelines does it demand emphasis on Science and Engineering? The website guidelines very clearly include excellence in the Arts and Humanities as criteria for membership.

- -

The Subcommittee Report recommends methods of achieving AAU membership that are not feasible, and which actually conflict with the strategic vision outlined in UCR 2020: The Path to Preeminence. In particular, the authors of the subcommittee report have interpreted the criteria of AAU membership to emphasize UCR's reputation in

the sciences and graduate education. They ignore the fact that AAU requires quality faculty in the arts and humanities and in undergraduate education. In particular, the subcommittee report's recommendation that 170 hires be made "selectively in research-active disciplines such as education, science, and engineering" (1.3) will not merely promote lopsided growth, but in the present budget climate, will cause the further deterioration of research excellence in the humanities and arts and undergraduate education, therefore jeopardizing AAU membership. One has to question whether this report was written with full consultation, especially given that the very insightful dissent (Appendix B) was written by two members of CHASS, who detail the ways in which the report's recommendations will erode the impressive achievements of CHASS, especially as they correspond to the seven strategic goals outlined in The Path to Preeminence. It does not make sense to focus resources exclusively on hiring in the sciences and graduate education when UCR as a whole is also supposed to be achieving excellence in research and creativity activity across the board (strategic goal #1), fostering excellence in undergraduate education (goal #3) and securing its own infrastructure (#7) among others goals. AAU membership is not to be obtained through loopholes or selective presentation of UCR's strengths; if it were, any reasonable person would question its value relative to the larger goals outlined in The Path to Preeminence.

In The Path to Preeminence, Action #5 of Goal #1 is "ensuring that the campus has state-of-the-art facilities and equipment, including everything from performance studios to laboratories, from greenhouses to information technology, from libraries to instrumentation." Not only does the subcommittee report more or less ignore this general directive, it turns a blind eye to UCR's imperiled library, an urgent infrastructural catastrophe that will surely foreclose any possibility of AAU membership if not addressed. A March 16 letter to UCR faculty by John Baez, chair of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications, explains just how the budget crisis has decimated our library. At the very least, one would have expected the authors of the subcommittee report to have obtained statistics about AAU institutions' library funding for comparison with our own. The idea that UCR will attain AAU status by hiring in the sciences and recruiting graduate students, while its library has an annual book budget of $375,000, is absurd. Preeminent research institutions have well-funded libraries. UCR's library budget must be part of our calculations as we attempt to walk the path to preeminence.

----

1. funding amount should not be over-evaluated. While funding is important, what's more important is research activities including research outcomes and its impacts. A scholar is a scholar whose sole duty is to conduct scholarly work (research).

2. Service evaluation should be fair and takes into consideration of many factors. Each faculty member should offer due services for sure (on campus and external scholarly services). However, it's evaluation can be more complicated. For example,

the numbers of on-campus service slots are limited, which may not be fairly assigned to each faculty member. Often, faculty members may not get the assignment even though they do wish to serve. On the other hand, some service assignments are "rewarding" by itself already (course relief, etc). Therefore, such service role with "reward" should not be over-valued for academic promotion review. The key is that the "sources" of services are limited, hence, every member who wants to serve may not get the opportunity to serve.

- -

I have two general areas of comment and one cautionary suggestion

AAU Membership. First, I note that the committees strong emphasis on gaining AAU status, but the committee has not made a strong case for what that status will do for UCR and how it will make us a better University, more effective researchers and allow us to contribute more to society.   Instead there is a strong emphasis on increasing graduate enrollment and grant dollars with very little emphasis on the general goal of our campus and how that might fit the AAU organization itself.

On the first point (increasing graduate enrollment) I note two things. First, it is a historical fact that the undergraduate enrollment was increased rapidly and somewhat artificially (we took more students than we anticipated for a number of years) during the time Ray Orbach was chancellor (15 years ago) to gain more dollars from UCOP for growing the size and infrastructure of UC Riverside. While the increased in undergraduate enrollment was successful, the result of this increase was to artificially reduce the comparison number of graduate students (since that number is often expressed as a fraction of total student population) even as the absolute number of graduates continued to grow.   I note also that the committee report has at least one substantial error in the numbers of graduate students reported. The report shows 7 graduate students in Biology. But there are more than 50 students in the laboratories of Biology Faculty members.

A second concern is that there is such an emphasis on the amount of money that faculty can bring to the University that any discussion of our membership in the AAU as a result of scholarship is completely obscured. While it is very true that research in the sciences is expensive and underfunded by research grant dollars, it is not the case that only expensive research is quality research. Instead, often research that is moderate in cost is the source of incredibly important contributions. Often these contributions are not appreciated until many years after they were made, but they are important nonetheless. To increase and highlight the merit and promotion pressure on current and future faculty to increase grant dollars will likely result in faculty making decisions about research area based on the dollar amount available rather than their own academic interests. This cynical result may result in a short-term benefit to the university with regard to grant dollars at the expense of its effect on faculty morale, and long-term productivity.

Finally the approach of emphasizing big dollar research is flawed because it ignores research in areas that are traditionally much less expensive but no less important such as the Arts and Humanities.   Before discussing money, the discussion should about

what it means to have a university rather than a set of institutes or, worse, for profit companies.

Research Themes. The research themes strike me as an odd amalgamation of topics that are not well very articulated. I realize that these do not preclude other areas but the fields chosen are surprisingly restrictive and leave out a huge number of fruitful and promising areas. Moreover the choice of themes seems self-serving because they seem to reflect the general interests of many (notably not all) members of the committee rather than offering a useful view into the future.   I would think it much more fruitful to gather current themes form each of the current colleges rather than from such a small group of faculty as this. This will take some time, and involve disagreements for sure, but if we are starting with the premise that we are a University with both basic and applied research as well as in depth scholarly studies across all levels of knowledge, we have to be more deliberate in our approach. Some specific concerns about the current themes are: They seem to be focused on areas that are lucrative in dollars first and in knowledge second. They focus on technological development (which is not at all bad) with little focus on basic research that will extend those developments. Finally, there is only one theme that had anything to do with research being done in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. This is, even to scientists, extraordinarily insulting and narrow-minded.

Cautionary suggestion. We are all in really difficult times and it is apparent to me, after talking to many people across campus, that there is not one group that is more drastically hit by this crisis than another.   In some cases we feel the same pain, and in others it hits different colleges and departments differently. The University of California generally has three missions. First, research (both applied and basic), second teaching (to the top students in and out of the state at both a gradate and undergraduate level) and third to provide a public service to the state (this can be broadly interpreted and includes outreach, agriculture, activism in social issues etc). All of us may feel that our jobs, and what is expected of us, emphasize different areas but the university needs all three areas to fulfill its mission. Thus, we might expect that some areas are more expensive than others and that expense changes over time. We each may have more interest in one or the other mission over time. I think that we, the faculty should not get into arguments that pit college against college to exclusion. We ARE a university and we all have a (traditional) part to play.   This report is so heavily weighted towards specific sciences (particularly those represented by its members) that it is dangerous. I really appreciated the dissenting opinion by Richard and Dylan Rodriguez (bravo especially to reasons 1 and 2 on p. B-3), but I think we can not go to the extreme of suggesting that it would be more effective and less expensive to focus all of our efforts in the opposite direction or we will not be taken seriously. This would be as much concerned with money as the committee's already problematic report.   If anything, while acknowledging the current budget climate, we need to request a far more balanced and less money driven response.

1. Tying promotions heavily to landing major grants as a blanket policy will be unfair, because it makes no allowance for the facts that a) arts and humanities grants represent only a small fraction of the total pool of federal grants (the report points out that 96% of federal grant dollars target science and engineering), and b) even within the sciences, there is tremendous variation in the size of grants available and the size of grants awarded. For example, even a modest biochem or biomed grant will typically be well over a million dollars, whereas for many other branches of science (e.g., organismal biology, ecology, USDA funded entomology grants) this would represent an enormous, once-in-a-lifetime type of grant, if you were lucky.

     As an addendum, I am also opposed to the idea of awarding people permanent off scale bonuses for landing grants, because they may never get another grant, i.e., a one-time achievement should be rewarded with a one-time bonus of off scale but coming back on scale at a fixed time. A better alternative would be to simply give faculty what would amount to a one-time cash bonus for landing a big grant, with the bonus to be paid out of indirect costs, STIP, or some similar fund.

2. The report repeatedly mentions providing relief from teaching and other typical faculty responsibilities for faculty that pursue and/or land big grants, particularly those involving groups. However, this strikes directly at the heart of the teaching mission, by relegating teaching more and more to less active and presumably less able people, and it might open the door to what I regard as the reprehensible practice of using graduate students to teach undergraduate courses in the sciences. I know that this practice is commonplace in at least one other college on campus, but if I were an undergraduate paying $10,000 plus in tuition fees alone, I would be pretty ticked off to have a good chunk of my instruction given by graduate students instead of professors.

3. Cluster hiring has both positives and negatives. Positive is that you presumably hire a critical mass of people in a given area, so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Negative is that it may not be very flexible, i.e., today's hot topic could be old news 5 years from now, and then you have to figure out what to do with the cluster. Furthermore, having advisory groups to recommend clusters and the allocation of new resources may just reinforce the status quo rather than being able to project outside the needs of one's own group and ones own interest and self-interest. Case in point is the list of research/cluster themes that was generated by this committee, which is clearly slanted towards the interests of committee members; if another group of faculty had been selected for this committee, they would probably have come up with a different list of priorities, but the overall result woudl probably be the same, i.e., a list biased by the committee makeup. Another case in point: the situation in the School of Education, where they have repeatedly hired their own graduates, rather than hiring outside people to bring in fresh blood, fresh ideas, etc..

-- On my point 2, I would appreciate it if you would at least point out the conflict caused by increased relief from teaching and other duties versus the undergrad and grad teaching missions. It is presumably a zero sum game, so that more time focused on research related work means less time for the teaching mission.
-- Re. cluster hires, I agree that they can be a powerful tool, but I think it would be useful

if the report were to also point out some of the possible consequences, such as how to realign, retool, or redistribute cluster people if the field moves on.

-- in the current document, the emphasis is entirely on rewarding people who get large grants. However, I would suggest that the emphasis should really be on people who get large grants, OR who piece together sizable sums from smaller grants. I.e., I would suggest that the focus should be primarily on the aggregate of funding, and the size of the research gruop that it funds. In fact, they should almost be rewarded more, because they probably have to do far more work overall to get and maintain a series of smaller grants rather than one large one.

26 March 2010

To: Anthony Norman, Chair, UCR Academic Senate

From: David Herzberger, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee

Re: Comments on Draft #1 of UCR Strategic Plan

Below are the salient ideas of the CHASS Executive Committee related to Draft #1 of the Strategic Plan. We endorse the call (both implicit and explicit) within the document for the promotion of excellence and diversity at all levels of university life. We are concerned specifically, however, about the following:

1.   The logic of the document concerning research is somewhat befuddling. By this we mean the following (extracting the logic as best we can): the document proposes enhanced support for programs of excellence, lower levels of support (perhaps at a maintenance level) for programs not deemed as excellent. The document then identifies several programs/departments of excellence unrelated to any specific facts (based on what criteria, we would ask, are those programs considered to be excellent when the university has yet to undertake a study of excellence?). The document uses as a strong indicator of excellence a citation system that is irrelevant to the majority of disciplines on campus, proposes that a series of metrics will be established to identify programs of excellence, and affirms that decisions concerning resource allocation will be data driven (linked to metrics). Hence the break-down of logic: how can the university identify programs of excellence before establishing metrics that would identify programs of excellence? The several programs that are named at the beginning of the document may indeed be fine programs, but we urge that a discipline-appropriate system of metrics be developed for each program/department, that the system be implemented and actually used to determine excellence, and only then should resources be allocated to the identified programs. We endorse the goal of sustaining (and developing) strong programs; we urge that a fair system, without the pre-judging of programs, be developed and implemented.

2.   The word "Humanities" is not used in the draft of the strategic plan. Further, the arts, while mentioned, seem to be perceived largely as an "enrichment" of university life (rather than a group of disciplines with their own bodies of knowledge and scholarship/creative activities). Since we aspire to reach the standards of AAU universities, we strongly urge that UCR understand fully that that guidelines developed by AAU place explicit emphasis on strength in the humanities and arts. If the strategic plan proposes taking funding from departments in humanities and art that are already excellent (e.g., we believe that the metrics mentioned in #1 above, when developed and implemented, will show that many programs of excellence exist in CHASS) in order to prioritize science and engineering, the standing of excellent humanities and arts departments will be at risk, thereby further undermining the push towards AAU quality

for UCR as a whole. The dissenting report of the Research and Creative Activity subcommittee makes this point very well.

3. Diversity (in students, faculty, administration, and staff) distinguishes UCR, and makes it a desirable campus for students of color and a model for achieving excellence while serving California's brightest students. We strongly urge that we continue to enhance our unique identity as a diverse and excellent campus. If we fall short on diversity, we dilute one of the best characteristics of UCR and lose our competitive advantage over less diverse universities. The 11 comparison AAU universities used for the Plan are considerably less diverse than UCR.

4. We urge that the staff at UCR be given greater recognition in the Plan, for without a committed and well-compensated staff, the Plan is unachievable. We urge robust investment in staff infrastructure and development.

5. We are fully aware of the budget difficulties facing UCR (and UC as a whole). As we think through enrollment of undergraduate versus graduate students, we strongly urge that any increase in fees be divided appropriately among aid for undergraduate students, classroom support that will provide smaller class sizes for undergraduates, and graduate student support. Support in these three areas is critical for UCR in its pursuit of excellence and diversity.

April 2, 2010

To: Anthony W. Norman
        Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

From: Marylynn V. Yates
        Chair

RE: Review of UCR 2020 – The Path to Preeminence, Draft #1

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed UCR 2020 – The Path to Preeminence, Draft #1 at its meeting of March 30, 2010. Comments were also solicited via email.

The Committee has some general comments regarding the manner in which the report is being/will be processed, as well as comments on the substance of the report. Because of its relative importance to our committee's charge concerning undergraduate curricula, the undergraduate education subcommittee report was also reviewed by some of the committee members. The main focus of our comments is on the section related to undergraduate education.

General comments/questions:

- As currently written, the draft report is not a strategic plan, as there is no prioritization of any of the recommendations. How will the recommendations be prioritized, by whom, and will the prioritized recommendations be available to review?
- There are contradictory statements and recommendations throughout the draft report. How will these discrepancies be resolved, and by whom?
- Many of the recommendations made in the eight subcommittee reports are not included in the draft report. How were the decisions to exclude certain recommendations made, and by whom?
- Will the feedback on the draft report be sent back to the subcommittees for their consideration, possibly leading to revisions of the subcommittee reports?
- If there are elements of the subcommittee reports that are not included in the final Strategic Plan, will the subcommittee reports continue to be available for people to read? If so, this may lead to confusion over which recommendations take priority, and why certain recommendations (*i.e.*, a subset of those in the subcommittee reports) are not being implemented at all.
- The draft report refers to working documents that are "currently in development". Who is writing these working papers and when will they be available for review?

- The limited emphasis on agricultural research is of concern for a land grant university. The Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension faculty who carry a strong allegiance to the agricultural mission are likely to take the 2020 UCR vision as a mandate for the AES/CE component of UCR to find a home elsewhere.

Specific comments:

Strategic Goal #1, Action #2: Strengthening the Culture of Research and Scholarship

- The experience of some Committee members has been that new faculty are currently penalized during their merit reviews if given reduced teaching loads in their early years to allow them to establish viable research programs. The proposed action will require major changes, especially in the academic personnel review process.

Strategic Goal #1, Action #4: Optimizing Organizational Structure in Support of Research

- Achieving critical mass can be achieved through expanded interdisciplinary research programs (e.g., Biochemistry & Molecular Biology and Cell, Molecular, & Developmental Biology graduate programs) without the disruption of combining academic departments and taking faculty time that could otherwise be devoted to efforts to increase extramural funding or attract graduate students.
- Reorganizing colleges will result in similar disruptions. An exhaustive process was undertaken to examine alternate organizations for CNAS just a few years ago; what is the rationale for reexamining this issue?

Strategic Goal #1, Action #6: Identifying and Hiring in Areas of Strategic Priority

- How were the six "Areas of Strategic Priority" determined? They do not appear in any of the subcommittee reports. Who is writing the narrative that supports these "Areas of Strategic Priority", and when will those narratives be available for review?
- Identifying only six priority areas for a campus that will presumably number well over 20,000 students by 2020 seems too narrow.

Strategic Goal #2, Action #1: Creating a Primary Focus on Graduate Education

- If priority for funding is to be given to graduate education, how will it be possible to implement any of the recommendations regarding undergraduate education?

Strategic Goal #3, Action #1: Enhancing Academic Advising

- The role of the faculty as an undergraduate mentor is only vaguely, and very confusingly, described. Will the 14 freshman from the Ignition Seminar become

the faculty member's advisees for the rest of their undergraduate careers? If so, how do the faculty interface with the staff in the undergraduate advising centers? For students not majoring in the faculty member's home department, how does one coordinate with any faculty mentors from the major (who are much more qualified provide career advice)? Or, does the faculty member really become a mentor only during the capstone experience? How do these two activities (freshman and senior) mesh (if at all)?

- It is assumed that the centralized undergraduate advising centers and the "professional" advisors are superior to any alternative models (*e.g.,* department-based, faculty advising etc.). This assumption needs to be critically tested for its validity.

Strategic Goal #3, Action #2: Expanding First-Year Learning Communities

- The marginal gains from freshman participation in First Year Learning Communities are so low (~4% in second-year retention (footnote 27, p. 12, undergraduate education subcommittee report)) that they could be characterized as more of a failure than a success, especially in view of the resources involved (a double-digit improvement would be much more noteworthy).
- The increased student contact with faculty implies that we will be recruiting a lot more faculty - or are workloads going to increase?

Strategic Goal #3, Action #3: Ignition Seminars

- There is an implicit assumption that the faculty-led seminar is an important component of first-year student success. On the contrary, the available data and experiences would suggest otherwise. It is proposed that the faculty engage in this exercise, assuming that expanding the faculty role to 4 units of class time will improve the situation. What data support this assumption? Advising seminars started out as 1 unit, and then were expanded to 2 units. That increase did not produce a large improvement in first-year student success. If the 4-unit seminars don't produce the desired results, will we expand them to 8 units? Twelve?
- The statement that the "Ignition Seminars" will be a standard part of the teaching responsibilities of Senate faculty implies that there will be a large increase in faculty hiring, that faculty workloads will increase substantially, and that upper division and graduate instruction will have to decrease.
- Implementation of this program implies a complete revamping of the requirements for graduation.
- The statement is made that faculty will raise the bar of expectations for our students. Does this mean that the administration will support faculty who, by raising the bar, cause a significant increase in the failure rate?

Strategic Goal #3, Action #4: Providing a Capstone Experience

- The undergraduate education subcommittee report endorses the General Education alternative concentrations (p. 23). But it fails to note that these

alternatives already contain <u>two</u> capstone components (the 198-I internship and the 19x capstone class). In addition, the report seems to want all students to have a capstone experience *in their major,* for a total of three. This seems incredibly resource-intensive. There is also concern about the language on p. 17 of the subcommittee report that it is "likely" that a Senate member will supervise these activities in "most" cases. If not a Senate member, who else could supervise a meaningful senior thesis, research project, academic internship, etc.?

- Is this likely to be useful (or even possible) for those students who are barely passing, which is a significant proportion of our students?

In general, the CNAS Executive Committee is concerned that it will not be possible to do everything that is being recommended in the Strategic Plan – from emphasizing graduate education to teaching 4-unit introductory-levels seminars to writing large-scale training grants or center proposals - without increasing the number of faculty or substantially increasing workload. For example, both the proposed 4-unit Ignition Seminars and the proposal to offer every undergraduate student a capstone experience will expend so much faculty time that Strategic Goals #1 and #2 (expanded excellence in research and graduate education) will be compromised. Disparate priorities scattered throughout the Strategic Plan would make it difficult for faculty to knowledgeably budget scarce "free" time to these various activities – regardless of their individual merits.

Date: April 2, 2010

To: Anthony Norman
        Chair of the Academic Senate
        University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell
        Chair of the Faculty
        Bourns College of Engineering
        University of California, Riverside

The BCOE Executive Committee discussed draft 1 of the UCR Strategic Plan at its meeting on April 2, 2010. Following is a summary of the main points of the conversation.

We strongly support the goal of having UCR become recognized as a top-tier research university. To become *recognized* as a top-tier research university, UCR must choose a widely accepted standard against which to measure ourselves. We therefore also agree that the use of the AAU standards is the best means of evaluating UCR's progress towards this goal. AAU membership is the right standard both externally and internally, as demonstrated in UC's recent discussion concerning whether campuses which are AAU members could charge higher fees. The profile of an AAU campus is essential to being recognized as first-tier UC campus.

We also strongly support the establishment of a metric-based culture of evidence. Every unit on campus (academic and non-academic) should determine how it contributes to the campus mission and define metrics and benchmarks useful for measuring the extent of its contribution to that goal. The metrics must be unit-specific and easy to compute and understand. Each academic unit's metrics must measure at least: excellence in research and scholarly activity, excellence in undergraduate education, excellence in graduate education, extramural support, and efficient use of resources. Non-academic units should measure their success by how well they support academic units in their pursuit of these goals.

- Research and Scholarly Activity: UC's mandate for research and scholarship is what distinguishes it from the other publicly supported institutes of higher education in the state. All academic and non-academic units should bear this point in mind and be oriented towards its enhancement. Unit-specific metrics allow demonstration of contributions relative to peer units in other top universities.

- Undergraduate Education: This is a foundation for academic excellence. We strongly support enhancing access, diversity, and student quality. Enrollment management is essential to achieving these three goals with the finite resources available, to manage the distribution of students across campus, and especially to enhance the quality and persistence of the entering students without adversely affecting access or diversity.

  UCR has a duty to work to promote the success of every student that we accept; however, UC's mission does not include preparation of students to start a college education. That is the role of

the high schools and community college system. Accepting students for admission to UCR who are not prepared can be a disservice to the student in terms of time to degree, retention, and educational cost to the student and to society. Instead of accepting unprepared students directly from high school, we support increasing the recruitment of properly prepared transfer students from the community colleges, and redeploying the resources currently used for preparatory education to enhancing the quality of undergraduate education for suitably prepared students. By this approach UCR would more effectively manage its enrollment to focus more effectively on the UC mission.

- Graduate Education: This is a specific mission of UC, and a goal in itself, but is tightly coupled to research and scholarly activity. Increasing the proportion of graduate students at UCR is vital to fully participating in the UC mission. Even though some areas of research may require little extramural support for faculty salaries or equipment, the graduate educational portion of the UC mission does necessitate extramural support, especially if UCR has the goals of access and diversity.

  Academic units cannot expect to fully support their graduate programs using state general funds (central fellowships and TA's). We support the objective of changing the campus culture to encourage efforts to obtain extramural support by faculty in all disciplines. The percentage of the graduate program supported by extramural funding is an important metric in determining its viability and contribution to campus goals.

- Extramural Support: Research, scholarly activity, knowledge creation, and graduate education are items that distinguish UC from the other elements of the California higher educational system. All UCR faculty should be involved in such activities. Extramural funding is a widely-used measure of the vitality of research activities. The merit and review process should be revised to recognize related activities, such as generation of extramural support.

We also support the strategic hiring of research-oriented faculty in areas of importance to support or promote new or emerging areas within the research and educational mission. An important consideration in making such new hires is that they are expected to increase the campus extramural funding profile.

While UCR has made significant progress in promoting a sense of community on campus, we have two broad areas of concern. First, our campus has yet to adequately address the issue of promoting a sense of belonging among students. This is clearly evident in the lack of student activity on campus after hours. Second, faculty participation in the daily life on campus is limited. A topic of concern was faculty who organize their schedules to minimize their time on campus, sometimes spending no more than a day or two on campus. This does not promote a vibrant intellectual campus environment.

We strongly support any efforts to enhancing transparency of the resource allocation and decision making processes, especially with regard to the financial situation on campus. This lack of transparency has resulted in only a few individuals on campus having any clear understanding of our fiscal situation.

We also strongly supported the idea of encouraging a more service - and less compliance - oriented approach from the non-academic units. The two units that were specifically mentioned were Office of Research Administration and Physical Plant (e.g., Infrastructure changes, refuse removal, recycling). Some faculty also took exception with the idea that ORA would be defining the mission for research centers or evaluating them.

In certain areas we thought that the document was more tactical than strategic. For example, in the undergraduate areas, many specific tactics were advocated instead of clearly stating the strategic goals.

Finally, there were a few very specific points:
- P. 19 – The text seems to state that we should encourage high quality UCR undergraduates to stay at UCR for graduate school. While that may be good for UCR, it is questionable whether it is good for a student to get all their degrees for any single institution. Also, this is a tactic. Why is it in a strategic plan?
- P. 32 – We support the idea of increased diversity of religious beliefs, races, and political attitudes at UCR. However, the religious and political views are not known either for potential students or faculty, and it is illegal to use them in making admission or hiring decisions. It is very unclear how this goal will be attained. Something needs to be re-phrased.

To: Anthony Norman, Chair
        Riverside Division, Academic Senate

From: Undergraduate Admissions Committee

        V.-L. Nyitray, Chair (Religious Studies)
        C. Amrhein (Environmental Sciences)
        S. E. Clark (Psychology)
        J.M. Heraty, BOARS Rep (Entomology)
        R.A. Kea (History)
        M. Marks (Economics)

Re: Response to Strategic Planning Report of the Subcommittee on Excellence in
        Undergraduate Education

Date: March 31, 2010

Having read the subcommittee's report with due diligence, the Undergraduate Admissions
Committee would like to thank subcommittee members for their significant investment of time
and effort; we appreciate the work they have done to stimulate discussion of UCR's future
development of undergraduate education.

With regard to the specific strategic recommendations offered by the subcommittee, we
respectfully submit the following observations, queries, and suggestions:

Academic Advising

- In our view and experience, campus advisors do their best work with our freshmen and
  sophomores, guiding them through general education requirements and keeping them on
  track to major selection or confirmation; their function and success with juniors and
  seniors is less clear.   One committee member wondered if some of that upper division
  and major-focused advising might not be directed to faculty, or to faculty-advisor teams,
  in which faculty advise on specific courses that are appropriate to particular interests
  and/or career paths, and advisors keep students on track to other degree requirements and
  provide the guidance in students' personal lives, as stated in the report.   Such
  individualized advising, although requiring a time commitment from faculty, could be
  more effective than offering more general advice in classes such as the proposed ignition
  seminars.   In line with this query was the observation of another member, who felt that
  the issue is not one of ratio but of expertise in specific subject areas; how could a single
  advisor be expected to have the degree of familiarity necessary to advise not only on
  courses that fulfill a requirement but that are preferable, one over another, in doing so?

- The report is unclear as to the number of additional advisors that would need to be hired
  to achieve the mandated 300:1 ratio. What is the projected cost? Similarly, what is the

cost of implementing the recommendations listed on p. 11 regarding infrastructure, ongoing professional development and training for advisors, data collection and evaluation, and so on? Our committee realizes that this report is a strategic vision statement and not a settled blueprint, but we feel that some recognition of resource commitment is important in sorting out priorities and in identifying timelines; in the current budget climate, these recommendations cannot neither be implemented at once nor implemented simultaneously. What is realistic?

- Our committee would appreciate clarification of the term "proactive advising"; how does this differ from UCR's current practice?

First Year Learning Communities

- Our committee felt that the report's evidence for success is tempered by two factors: the relatively short history of these courses on our campus and the self-selecting nature of participants, the latter factor influencing retention rates, for example. We would welcome a fuller exposition of the ongoing tracking of students who have participated in the various iterations of FYLC on this campus and at UCLA, which has had similar programs.

- We applaud the restatement of UCR's commitment to serving local and regional populations, many of whom are first-generation college students or who face other challenges in obtaining a college education. Such students are likely to benefit from a focused and possibly smaller class environment in their freshman year, along with the stable cohort of peers provided by the FYLC and its mentors. However, a recurrent observation among our committee members was that a "one size fits all" approach may disadvantage students on both ends of the spectrum. Our committee raised a concern—not addressed in the report as a whole—of the possibly disproportionate ratio of effort expended to offer support and remedial assistance to our lowest-achieving students vs. the effort expended to encourage and stimulate higher-achieving students, some of whom may opt not to participate in the University Honors Program. The concern is that "the best and brightest" are not attended to in the creation of programs such as FYLC: for example, these students might be tracked into sections in which less attention is paid to writing or math remediation, or to the development of study skills, and in which more attention is directed to enrichment, augmentation, and testing of skills that may already be considerable or, at the least, already appropriate to college work. We urge some involvement—perhaps under the leadership of the Preparatory Education Committee—in identifying such students and in creating a more robust learning environment for them. We want them to be excited about coming to UCR—and to stay here and complete their degrees. Our committee's concern was that as the campus develops FYLC options, we seek as well to increase our retention of top tier students, i.e., those with entering GPAs of 3.6-3.9.

"Ignition" Seminars

- Our committee endorses the idea of a great start for a strong finish but believes the present vision of ignition seminars is fiscally and pedagogically problematic. During our lengthy discussion, committee members recalled the Freshman Discovery Seminars that, as one-unit courses, were not successful despite offering students the opportunity to work on often fascinating topics with senior faculty. When reworked as two-unit Freshman Advising seminars in CNAS, and then combined with Learning Communities, the courses were again deemed unsuccessful. The proposed ignition seminars, conceived of now as four-unit courses, will seek to combine study skills instruction, major preparation, and career advising, even as they strive to meet major and/or general education requirements. It was the consensus of our committee members that these seminars are trying to be all things to all people and are, in the words of one member, "doomed to failure."

- More narrowly, we note that, given significant variations in necessary skill sets as well as career aspirations and possibilities across (and even within) departments on campus, the call for faculty to offer course content in these areas via the ignition seminars is impractical. It also appears to overlap significantly with the work of professional advisors on campus, particularly if they are called to "developmental academic advising" (p 10). A related question arises from the suggestion that students in "popular departments, such as psychology or political science" might be enrolled in ignition seminars taught by faculty "from other, lower-enrolled departments": how could a faculty member from creative writing or dance, for example, serve to advise students on skills or career paths possible in psychology?

- Several members of our committee suggested that the Freshman Discovery Seminars be revived and reconfigured to serve the best purposes of the proposed ignition seminars, viz., help students feel personally connected to faculty and a research-oriented peer group, explore major and career possibilities, and be a badge of the UCR experience. By offering the seminars as two-credit courses with compressed or flexible timing (two hours/week for five weeks; full day field courses on weekends; etc.), workload credit is more easily accommodated within departments and student engagement is more likely than with a single one-hour/week meeting. The signal difference is that the FDS were faculty-driven in terms of content, in great contrast to the constrained needs of the proposed ignition seminars.

- The subcommittee's report indicates that these ignition seminars can be staffed through a "re-allocation" of faculty time, a plan that our committee found to be unrealistic, even profoundly so. If every faculty member is expected to teach one seminar every other year, that translates into one half of every department's faculty being removed from teaching a course in the present curriculum every year. While it may be possible to reconfigure some existing courses into ignition seminars, the addition of study skill instruction, career advising, etc., necessarily displaces current content and either diminishes the breadth and/or depth of the present course, or else necessitates the creation of a new course to augment/complete the ignition seminar.

Capstone Experience

- We applaud the broad vision of the capstone "experience" rather than a mandated seminar, thesis, or project; however, once again, the key issue raised in our discussions was time and faculty workload. Some on our committee expressed the view that a capstone experience might be cast as an opportunity rather than as a requirement; this suggestion derives from the recognition that not all undergraduates can participate in "world class" research. Moreover, the mentoring of students in often- or necessarily-individualized study takes significant time and effort that will detract from the research demanded of faculty on a UC campus.

Admissions

- Our committee agrees with the report's recommendation to realign admissions criteria and recruitment policies. In accordance with the new Freshman Eligibility Construct approved by the Board of Regents on February 5, 2009, our committee is presently undertaking a thorough review of current practices in order to put forth new policies and practices for approval and implementation in Fall 2012.

- A last language note for clarity: UCR already undertakes a "comprehensive review" of admissions files; we understand the report's recommendations to be that UCR move toward a "holistic" or possibly even a "full read" of admissions files in order to increase selectivity while maintaining diversity and access. Our committee is actively considering the range of options available given the need to balance desired outcomes with fiscal constraints.

General

- Although the report offers a striking vision for future strategic planning efforts, the success of this vision requires a significant buy-in from faculty; our committee notes that concomitant administrative responsibilities are not foregrounded in the report, as we believe they must be.

- Similarly, the report as a whole lacks attention to the resource issues that will facilitate or obstruct the realization of strategic planning efforts; our committee believes that there are significant resource issues—in particular, for faculty—that are unaddressed or insufficiently addressed at nearly every step.

April 30, 2010

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: MORRIS MADURO, ACTING CHAIR
        GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: **UCR2020: The Path to Preeminence**
        and Report of the Excellence in Delivery of Graduate Education (EDGE)

An *ad hoc* subcommittee of the Graduate Council consisting of myself, Alan Williams, Deborah Wong (also a past chair of Graduate Council) and Gary Coyne (grad student rep) met on April 23, 2010 to discuss the Commission on the Future Recommendations. A draft of this document was circulated to the Graduate Council and members were given the opportunity to provide feedback.

Overall the Council strongly endorses the recommendation that graduate education should be a central focus of the UCR campus and that cuts due to the financial crisis spare graduate resources as much as possible. Graduate education and research are what distinguish the UC system from the CSUs, and without a strong graduate program, UCR will not attract the best students and faculty. The EDGE document has done an outstanding job of highlighting the issues, and has compiled a very large and useful dataset that can be used to inform decision making. We had some comments.

Defining excellence. The EDGE document refers to 'excellence' in graduate programs. The quantitative information about GRE scores, etc. are a good start in objectively determining whether programs are 'excellent.' Other good criteria include where finished graduate students are placed, which is based largely on their productivity in their doctoral work. (Table B-14, Placement of PhD Students, is a good start for this but we need more information of this type.) Different types of programs have different measures of what constitutes success, and this can vary greatly among the colleges and programs. Graduate Council's process of Grad Program Reviews make a good staring point for measuring, evaluating, influencing and monitoring each program's drive toward excellence. The fact that the Council utilizes external reviewers who are expert in each respective field provides evaluation tailored to each program.

Overall, we note a strong bias in this document toward the sciences. Prioritizing graduate programs that can support graduate students through grants is simply unrealistic for the arts and humanities.

The following specific points are referenced to the EDGE report but they also appear in the UCR2020 report.

1.1 – *All faculty hires should include justification based on the expected contribution to graduate education.* The Council noted that it does make sense to prioritize hiring decisions based on the intentions of faculty to train graduate students, if the goal is to build stronger graduate programs. There are two issues that should be considered. First is the issue of academic freedom. Faculty may find that existing graduate programs do not attract the right kind of students and would conversely feel that hiring postdocs, while necessary for their research enterprise, is punitive. Second, if otherwise well-qualified prospective faculty feel pressured to take only graduate students at UCR, they may go elsewhere. (For senior hires, a track record of strong graduate training would obviously be a basis for prioritization.) Last, programs should not lose sight of the bigger picture: An accomplished faculty member who has few graduate students might serve to attract other faculty who will make substantive contributions to graduate training.

1.2 *The reward structure for faculty should be altered to provide concrete incentives for quality training and mentoring of graduate students.* The Council is in favor of such a reward structure. Many faculty also contribute to teaching in graduate programs, which is a less direct contribution to mentoring/training. Preparation for these can be more demanding as content has to be current and there is no TA support. As such teaching also constitutes a substantive contribution to training of graduate students, faculty who teach in graduate courses should receive some kind of recognition for this contribution. Otherwise there may not be an incentive to teach at the graduate level (especially in interdepartmental programs). As well, there are other forms of service that have a strong impact on graduate education, such as being on supervisory/dissertations committees and service on Graduate Council or within the Graduate Division.

1.2.2 *Unit granting, but unscheduled, teaching (e.g. 290s, 299s) and the direction of dissertations should be counted as part of the official teaching load campuswide.* Grad Council strongly supports this view, and notes that some departments appear to be doing this already, while others do not; a standardized counting system, at least within colleges, would be the most equitable for all departments. This is also essential as in many departments a small cadre of faculty carry the graduate program, from recruitment all the way through to graduation.

1.2.3 *Graduate Council should promulgate mentoring standards...* Guidance in mentoring could be incorporated into the training that new faculty are given when they arrive at UCR.

1.3 *The reward structure for faculty should be altered to provide concrete incentives for obtaining external financial support for graduate students.* This emphasis might negatively affect progress of faculty in the humanities, as in general, humanities programs attract fewer grants with smaller amounts than the sciences, although the Council supports a reward structure for those who seek and receive grants. It is worth noting also that most Humanities departments may not have the infrastructure to win large grants.

1.4 *Launch media relations initiative to spotlight important contributions of UCR graduate students.* The Council noted that UCR's media relations already gives press releases on important research accomplishments of graduate students, although only a small subset of

these get carried by other media outlets. In the broader picture, highlighting the importance of graduate research serves to educate the public about the graduate mission of UC. Advertising UCR as a graduate school (in general, not tied to particular graduate student achievements) could also serve the purpose of 'getting the word out,' and this should be linked to the recruitment of high quality graduate students.

2. *Increase the proportion of graduate students at UCR to 20% of total student population.* The Council would like to see this increase, although it wonders if this goal is realistic.

2.3 *Target growth in <u>academic</u> graduate programs to support those with demonstrated track record of excellence according to objective metrics.* And 3. *Growth and development of graduate programs should be based on excellence.* Again, the issue of what constitutes an 'excellent' program has to be considered. As well, why not invest in a graduate program that is in an emerging area that has not met the definition of 'excellence'? The results of external reviews of graduate programs, run by Graduate Council, should be considered.

4. *Graduate student financial support should be funded at a level that enables UCR to provide multiyear support packages...* The Council has no argument with this goal as we would like to be as competitive as possible with other campuses. Without adequate funding for competitive packages, no graduate program can achieve prestige even with outstanding faculty. We need more money for multi-year packages especially in this budget climate, where TAships are becoming less and less dependable. In short, the current model is broken and needs to be replaced, though the Council is also left wondering where the money is going to come from.

4.6 *Provide resources to assist graduate students in securing extramural fellowships; create incentives for students to apply for these fellowships.* A full-time position in Graduate Division could be responsible for identifying such opportunities and working with students to complete timely applications. As well, the Council noted that many programs (as shown in the appendix) may not attract many students who are qualified to apply for outside support.

5. *Promote sense of ownership and goal achievement within graduate programs.*
And 9. *Improve structure of interdepartmental/intercollege programs (IDPs)*
The Council noted that in some colleges, the structure of departments may work counter to this objective (e.g. in contemplating future hires). One solution is to align graduate programs with a department; another is to restructure departments to align with the strongest graduate programs. Graduate programs *and* departments should be constructed in a way as to attract the best students to their programs.

5.1 *Each program should outline the vision and goals for their graduate training…* Senior graduate students in each program should be included in this process.

5.3 *Each program is charged with reviewing its performance on the metrics on a yearly basis...* The Council already performs external reviews every ~8 years, and internal reviews every 3-4 years. Such reviews, when done properly, consume a lot of resources,

and it is not clear if each graduate program (particularly interdepartmental ones) have the staffing and time to perform annual reviews, or will be motivated to be objective about them. Grad Council's inability to perform reviews on a shorter recurring interval (because of cost and effort needed) indicates the difficulty of doing such external or even internal reviews of all programs every year or two. At least, Graduate Council reviews of a program could take the place of an annual review for a particular year.

6. *Improve recruitment strategies to attract stronger and more diverse graduate students.* The Graduate Division already makes such efforts (e.g. UCR is a major sponsor of the upcoming 2010 SACNAS meeting (Society for the Advancement of Hispanics/Chicanos and Native Americans in Science)) but the campus could be doing more. Ultimately, many graduate students choose the program that offers the best support, so we need more resources to create better packages.

6.2 *Programs should establish and maintain strong relationships with "feeder' schools...* The Council recognizes that the Associate Deans in Graduate Division already devote part of their time to this objective. There are also such efforts by discipline or graduate program, but these often rely on the engagement level of graduate advisors in charge of recruitment. Such effort can vary quite considerably, and lacks a 'history' when the role is passed on to another faculty. If the number of graduate students is to go up significantly, the campus should consider hiring a full-time person to be responsible for identifying such recruitment opportunities and for attending recruitment events to promote UCR.

7.1 *Professional development training should be a requirement of all academic Master's and PhD programs at UCR.* The Council strongly supports this requirement. Part of this training should include a frank awareness of the availability of jobs after the PhD within each program, as part of an explanation of the vision and goals to each student on entering. As suggested in the document, graduate programs should offer various types of ways to comply with such a requirement, as different graduate students will have varied long-term goals, which are also field-specific. The Council was concerned about further lengthening the time to degree if there is an exam requirement. The Council also wondered where the staffing and additional resources will come from and suggests that wherever possible, resources should be pooled.

8. *Long range planning should emphasize graduate student needs.* 8.1-8.2 regarding campus housing: The Council is in favor of including the residence needs of graduate students in long-range planning. It was noted that the costs of building suitable family student housing, for example, are very high, and once again was concerned whether the resource will exist to subsidize monthly rent.

Morris Maduro
Acting Chair, Graduate Council