FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT
STRATEGIC PLAN: OVERALL RESPONSE

In addition to feedback regarding the overall Strategic Plan, many comments that were submitted as responsive to each of the themes were carried over as more broadly relevant; however, additional notes expressed appreciation for the opportunity to provide feedback as well as the positive steps UCLA is taking toward improvement. Summary responses received to the overall plan are provided for each constituent group.

Student Response Summary
Support is expressed for the overall plan; however, needs identified in the responses submitted include: more financial aid to international undergraduates; smaller class size; additional study space (open the closed floors of the library); responsible follow-up to online evaluations; greater focus on sustainability; formal TA training; priority for student safety; flexibility with accommodating students in crisis; support for the well-being of graduate student workers, lecturers, and professors.

Additional specific suggestions, recommendations and comments have been summarized as follows:
• The plan is too vague and lacks a clearly articulated vision and strategy. While it sets a general intent, the lack of specific measurable goals sets many of the areas up for failure. There should be at least one concrete plan for each idea.
• Recording lectures and making them immediately available online is a student centered approach that is utilized by the University of Melbourne and should be considered at UCLA. It is an effective tool for student review and ensures consistency, accountability and training for professors who teach the same course.
• This effort lacked engagement with graduate student leadership or the Graduate Student Association.
• A glaring shortcoming of the plan is the lack of focus on undergraduate education – the most fundamental of a public university's roles. Experience between departments within the same school revealed a comparative disparity despite offering the same subjects. One provided smaller and available classes, a major focus on business, civic, and academic engagement, and professional development encouraged by the professors. The other is overcrowded, understaffed, underfunded, and ignored by faculty and industry. Hiring more quality professors would help as well as a concerted effort to encourage participation in pre-professional clubs, partnering with the career center, and reaching out to industry leaders in
finance, consulting and technology to improve the pipeline of graduates into lucrative positions – our future alumni donors.

- The UCLA Strategic Plan 2018 is strong and demonstrates the trajectory the university has followed and should follow into the future. The five themes each reflect UCLA's vision to create positive social impact through innovative research, teaching, and public engagement. A sixth theme should be added if the university is to further fulfill its vision: Sustainability. The health of our environment, along with climate change, is among the most pressing issues facing humanity. In developing a model for sustained prosperity, the addition of this theme would also fulfill the university's mission to serve the public good.

**Faculty Response Summary**

Faculty reviews are mixed regarding the overall plan. Collective needs from the faculty perspective include a request for “support for the basics” and are listed as follows: smaller classes; additional and better equipped classroom space as well as faculty and staff office space; funding and space to conduct research; funding to hire tenure track faculty; better training and more pay for staff and faculty; more effective research administration; funding and support for writing and community engagement centers; assistance with publishing; time to do both teaching and research; incentives to help ease the cost of living in Los Angeles (housing, parking, childcare, education, etc.).

Additional specific suggestions, recommendations, and comments have been annotated as follows:

- The task force comments on education were vague and missed the major points essential to our core mission:
  
  1. Students are routinely unable to get into courses they need and the number of majors has skyrocketed with no increase in faculty numbers. One student, $50k in debt, and still UCLA cannot provide the required courses to graduate – a situation that is even worse for out-of-state students. How long can we charge non-resident students Harvard-level prices and then claim that key classes are closed or overflowing? Will the word get out that UCLA is not worth out-of-state prices?
  
  2. The lecture halls are an embarrassment. They are our public face to the community and a core teaching tool, but have holes in the walls, broken desks, and are ugly and dated. Ancient clunky, noisy A/V equipment impedes the lecturer and do not function well. An inquiry made five years ago elicited a response that improvements would be coming with a major initiative. There has been no change other than that the rooms are now five years older.
(3) Issue #1 is exacerbated by faculty who do not retire by a respectable age. Their decreasing abilities are accommodated through smaller classes and reducing their service. They have no funding and take on no Ph.D. students. It is the students who suffer most, yet there has been no effort to encourage timely retirement. The "Pathways" program is only one very weak element. Deans and chairs need to work persistently on the intransigent cases.

(4) The STEM units required to graduate have been reduced to the point where a non-STEM major can graduate with the science and math skills they brought with them from high school. This is the wrong direction for a 21st century education.

(5) It is dismaying how poorly some students (seniors) write. This is not about elegant style but basic mechanics of grammar and likely reflects poorly on UCLA as an institution with future employers. Perhaps this can be changed to a more rigorous proficiency-based requirement, which is now a critical need in light of the number of international students admitted (who are great but need to receive the education they believe they are getting to thrive in the U.S.).

• The report is disheartening. None of it is well written, nor does it articulate a vision of academic excellence around which problems and solutions are crafted. Some of it appears driven by a corporate mentality. A good deal of it seems to advocate creating new levels of administration and is focused on identifying new ideals for the sake of innovation. The best section was global outreach. It is surprising that there is nothing about faculty, student, and staff welfare in the strategic plan.

• UCLA is already doing many of the things mentioned in the reports. The question is why we aren't doing a better job with our existing structures and processes? The risk with this plan is that new structures will be created on top of old with added cost and complexity. It would have been better to ask, how can we fine tune our engines rather than, what are some cool new engines to buy? No attempt has been made to study other universities that have adopted strategic plans. Five years after formulating their plans, do they think the effort was worth the cost? What would they do differently?

• Although there is considerable merit to many of the proposals, the healthy behavior innovation proposal seems to have emerged out of the blue. It isn't clear why this specific project would be favored over dozens of others with similar merit and broad relevance. Intensive investment in this project would likely benefit a relatively small number of faculty and take valuable resources away from the more meritorious initiatives contained within the strategic plan.

• Revising the UCLA mission statement is a good idea but should precede the roll out of a strategic plan. The bias toward "large external funding" implicitly narrows the mission to
medicine and science (thereby marginalizing the arts, humanities, and social sciences) and defines the value of research innovation and impact in terms of revenue generation for the campus.

• I have reviewed all of the reports and published a comprehensive review: http://bicycleacademy.blogspot.com/2017/12/book-review-strategic-plan.html

UCLA should actively advocate with our surrounding communities to provide sustainable transportation options that are in keeping with the efforts of the Grand Challenge – especially with regard to addressing the poor biking infrastructure. I'm disappointed that this has not already been incorporated into the report, and I call on the committee to do so.

Staff Response Summary

Specific comments submitted have been annotated and summarized as follows:

• The overall plan needs to be broken down into actionable items; budget and implementation need to be verified for feasibility. Good ideas that need refinement.

• Overall, a really strong plan but it needs key improvements. Marketing this plan throughout its implementation is crucial. The plan should maintain high visibility and celebrate itself.

• Deploying the LEAN concept across campus is a positive step as it has been very useful in the health system. The idea of rewarding staff for community involvement is great and encourages work-life balance.

• The strategic plan is a good start and the breakdowns are great; however, there needs to be more support and appreciation for the “unsung heroes” on staff and greater collaboration between faculty and staff. A bottom-up approach is needed as well as an equitable compensation plan.

• Civic engagement and difficult discussions are included in this plan, but there is not much about increasing our student body diversity or bringing underrepresented groups further into the fold at UCLA. What are we doing to make UCLA and college in general accessible to more people?

• The majority of the themes seem heavily externally focused and the student experience appears to be missing from each of them. How are we defining Bruins? We have one of the most diverse student bodies in the country that will ultimately define UCLA’s place in the world – whether as alumni or in shaping current national and global debates. Isn't there something we can offer or aspire to model for higher education nationwide? With that will come a change in culture – right now students feel like the university is some large corporate entity that doesn't have their best interests in mind, and sadly this strategic report reflects it.
• Creativity in teaching, learning, research engagement, global outreach and effectiveness must be a part of every aspect of a new strategic plan. The arts should be part of the cornerstone to our undergraduate education and integrated into everything we do and think about at UCLA, including the strategic plan.

• The reports reflect a lot of hard work by distinguished people but lack credibility as the taskforces functioned at break-neck speeds, were not inclusive, departments under discussion were not consulted, existing innovations were ignored, and there was a lack of awareness of the vast inventory of projects already in place. An opportunity was missed to build strategic goals the campus could truly support.

• An amazing effort and body of work with some very interesting ideas; however, there is inconsistency with defining the pathway from specific solutions to an ambitious vision for the future. If all recommendations in the first four plans were implemented (excluding the institutional effectiveness section), how much would it really move the needle? Maintaining the status quo is not enough to move forward. We will need to take some risks.

• The plan reads like a laundry list of things that it would be nice to have, rather than an actual strategic plan, and it appears to have been written by committees who had little to no contact with each other or knowledge of each other's work. The recommendations include areas of overlap as well as direct conflict. There is little to no discussion of costs, tradeoffs, or existing activities that would need to be cut in order to finance these new ones. It is possible that all of these new programs would be worth the investment, but that is impossible to determine without a frank and transparent discussion of their costs.

• While the plan is ambitious and commendable, the total investment in the various components could reach $300 to $500 million over ten or more years. How will these efforts be supported without harming the established underlying quality?

• This plan is visionary, clear, and relevant, and the team did an incredible job of synthesizing ideas across our vast institution and developing transformative overarching programs. One recommendation could either be highlighted separately or woven throughout each area: continue to develop the campus as a living laboratory for health and sustainability. The draft of the Strategic Plan does not explicitly mention the physical campus except in the context of its limitations. Existing applied research programs at UCLA touch every area of this plan from civic engagement to effectiveness; they highlight education and research innovation; and they create demonstrations relevant for Downtown UCLA and Global Outreach. Our efforts to practice what we teach and integrate our operations and academics are innovative and powerful, and the efforts to make UCLA’s campus more efficient align with the goal of institutional effectiveness. The collaboration between faculty, staff, and students across the university touching hundreds of different departments through Sustainability and the Healthy
Campus Initiative, exemplify the type of institutional collaboration and effectiveness that the plan highlights. I would be happy to assist in weaving this theme throughout if there is interest, or writing a standalone piece to include in one of the areas.

**Alumni Response Summary**

Feedback submitted has been annotated as follows:

- General support was expressed for the overall plan (including both the local and global focus) and acknowledgement of all that UCLA has achieved in its first century with the potential for that legacy to continue.
- There needs to be a greater focus on students of color, especially low income students of color. Beyond increased housing, greater resources need to be dedicated to supporting black and undocumented students.
- If UCLA wants to be the leader of innovation into the future, it needs to grow imaginatively not just academically -- especially in the fields of health care, medicine and urban planning. Also, the food on campus is TERRIBLE. We should be the leader in GMO Free, Organic food options. Fast food should not be available on campus when there are plenty of healthier alternatives – especially in Los Angeles!
- One alumnus is unimpressed with the plan and how the information was presented. Hope was expressed that the outcomes of the feedback collection and the resulting strategic plan will inspire the UCLA community and external stakeholders in such a way that UCLA will not only be a leader in how HEIs need to evolve.

In addition, the following comments were re-posted by the responder(s) to ensure recognition beyond the summary feedback provided for the individual plans:

- **With regard to Research Innovation:**
  1. Who created this report, other sections are transparent about this, why not this one?
  2. Where does innovation and technology come into the future plans of research at UCLA?
  3. Why there is no further discussion of the 'research platform'. What will it include, what will it do?
  4. Why is it inferred that the MIT Media lab is not on campus? It is smack dab in the middle of the east campus.
  5. It is a big deal to have a medical center adjacent campus and UCLA benefits greatly by collaborating between medicine and the main campus. There is good reason to build a UCLA Media Lab equivalent on campus in addition to downtown.

- **With regard to Education Innovation:**
(1) The proposal to fund 200 million for this center to award independent “faculty grants” that may have no connected vision is worrisome and sounds like an incredible waste of funding.

(2) UCLA requires dedicated technologists who care about the mission of the university over vendors in delivering these innovations. There is a need for strong collaboration and partnership between faculty and UCLA professional technologists who can make educational innovation vision a reality.

(3) It appears that the guiding principle for the Education Innovation plan was not followed as there is a lack of input from UCLA’s dedicated professional innovative technology staff who understand how fast and furiously technology is changing. The world is being redefined by next generation technology visionaries in every industry, and yet UCLA did not include a single professional technologist in this effort.

(4) How will UCLA blend new technological environments into the learning experience without collaboration from those who can innovate in these technologies? Virtualized teaching and learning exercises across many disciplines are becoming the norm (e.g., see Immersive Journalism course at Brown: https://news.brown.edu/articles/2017/08/gaspee.)

(5) There is no mention of the need to invest in making UCLA a mobile-friendly educational environment or to make UCLA an accessible or ADA compliant educational environment.

**Donor Response Summary**

Feedback submitted by donors includes the following annotated comments:

- Appears promising but has a risk of simply increasing the bureaucracy. University administration has EXPLODED in headcount in the past few decades and needs streamlining while increasing effectiveness.

- Broad strokes…and not enough new. Push to develop a vision that will take UCLA to the next level and enable our campus (and students) to embrace the changing world. This plan seems stuck in the old paradigm, old goals (research, innovation, and other buzz words without real talk about changing the strategy).

- Some good plans (Research, Civic Engagement) with specifics, benchmarks, and pathways. Others were too vague with generalities, buzzwords, and a lack of focus, specifics, and benchmarks (Global Outreach, UCLA Education). These need more concrete solutions. Global Outreach with 12 goals is too many … pick 3-4 and go deep to be effective.
• It is most important for UCLA to maintain its role as an EDUCATIONAL/RESEARCH facility, and not as a competitive force (building its own hotels, stores, restaurants, and medical clinics) with the intention of driving others out of business.

Other Response Summary
Responses not already submitted within the individual plan feedback have been summarized as follows:
• Encouragement for greater collaboration between Anderson and the Health System.
• Support for the Strategic Plan and the individual proposed plans.
• An expression of hope that notice will be taken of the comments submitted; that they will be responded to and published.