FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT
THEME 5: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Student Response Summary
Most of the responses focused on specific requests such as reduction in class size, increased study space, additional student housing, improved infrastructure and maintenance (particularly the restrooms), and greater investment in campus sustainability efforts. General agreement was expressed for the need to improve institutional effectiveness through centralization and reduction in bureaucracy, administration, and layers of inefficiency, along with significant cultural changes to enhance collaboration and civility. One student suggested the creation of more online systems for access to information such counseling or financial aid rather than the need for appointments, as well as streamlining counseling services so that information provided is consistent. Another commented on the need for a clear emergency/disaster protocol that students are made aware of and have access to as demonstrated by the confusion surrounding the recent fire that impacted the campus.

Faculty Response Summary
Faculty were fairly consistent in their feedback, particularly with regard to the following specific comments/suggestions for increasing institutional effectiveness:

- Reduce the number of administrative positions instead of adding more; consideration should be given to outsourcing; before creating new initiatives identify positions and programs that should be cut back or eliminated.
- "Customer-oriented" is a misplaced term in academia and the language in the report appears to be based on popular notions and leading the university to an overly bureaucratic corporate model, which would affect both morale and the university’s uniqueness. KPIs are commonly used in corporate settings to quantitatively measure performance but much of the important work at the university is qualitative.
- The report does not clearly identify the problems or provide cost estimates. Hiring consulting firms is expensive and they are generally not well versed in university culture. In addition, academic standards should not be centralized if we are to maintain a free and lively intellectual culture.
- The “abysmal mountain of red tape” and arcane regulations pose a disincentive to the pursuit of creative outlets. Additional staff are needed to carry out administrative tasks – particularly in the humanities, social sciences, and arts.
• This report seems very general and does not make reference to the use of technology for enhancing educational outcomes and accommodating additional students within the current cost structure. Centralizing technology (IT) services is one way to innovate without using more resources.
• Bullying and bias need to be addressed in order to facilitate effective discourse.
• The gravest threat to UCLA's educational effectiveness is the rising cost borne by students and their families. It is crucial that the University provide education at lower cost, while maintaining quality, through legislative advocacy, robust fundraising, and directing substantial resources to financial aid and other cost reductions.

**Staff Response Summary**
Staff responses were generally supportive of the plan and touched on several of the topics raised by students and faculty (i.e., effective crisis management, focused sustainability, and reducing bureaucracy and use of external consultants). Additional recommendations and feedback provided in response to the specific action items included:
• Mandated training for faculty on change management and how to be effective managers and administrators. Train and empower tenure-track faculty to engage in critical discourse without fear of professional repercussions.
• Engage in more oversight of outcomes and performance rather than ideology. Key Performance Indicators and accountability are essential.
• This plan is a step in the right direction as UCLA lags behind other universities in institutional administration organization and innovative policies.
• Transparency, communication and trust comes from effective leadership that invests in its employees.
• Hopefully, the "lean team" will identify offices throughout campus that are engaged in overlapping or similar missions. For example, the staff and faculty-centered offices for diversity and compliance could be combined.
• The committee should also explore a 'navigation' group to serve as a resource for guidance and implementation that could then be made available through a shared knowledge database.
• A more effective and productive alternative to the creation of a broadly tasked 'centralization task force' would be to independently examine specific issues unique to the separate administrative and academic missions of the university.
• The report on Institutional Effectiveness provides a good theoretical framework for the administration of a large institution like UCLA, however, it lacks acknowledgment of the following:
(1) Existing bylaws, regulations, rules and guidelines that require certain functions to be centralized; for example, faculty/staff hiring (page 24).

(2) Effective leadership training programs that are currently in place at UC and UCLA.

(3) The KPIs reported by APB over the past decade.

Two task forces should be convened: one for academic units and one for staff supporting units. One "Centralization" Task Force will not be agile enough to identify and address problems effectively and efficiently.

- An effective strategic plan is ever-evolving and constantly revisited, and there must be a means for retaining institutional memory, cohesive succession planning, comprehensive electronic record keeping, and greater transparency. Engage experts in change management; tie effectiveness to incentives; use technology to be more innovative, less reactionary; and hire visionaries in executive positions who know how to navigate in lean times. We need diversity in our research, diversity in our staff, diversity in our faculty and in our role as a change-maker in LA.

Alumni Response Summary

Seven alumni responses were generally supportive of the plan and included the following comments:

- Consultants should be discouraged at all cost in the implementation of the recommendations; as a community we need to own our definitions and processes. There should be clear expectations for administration, faculty, student, alumni, donors and staff with regard to accountability in meeting university goals for effectiveness.

- A former graduate student described being dumbfounded by how technologically disconnected the campus was, “The Accounts Payable and Travel Accounting versus the Business Office within our school were using different database systems.”

Donor Response Summary

- How will UCLA ensure that forward progress is being made rather than simply increasing overhead?

- The In-House team makes more sense. Ask for volunteers across campus to participate, not just the faculty, and reward innovations.

Other Response Summary

Two responses that fell under the constituent category of “Other” included the following excerpted feedback:
• Institutional effectiveness would be greatly improved by retaining our best employees who have institutional memory and have already made major advances. Key talent is being lost to institutions providing greater incentives such as better pay.

• The Institutional Effectiveness Task Force report is likely well-intentioned but it lacks evidence and context, contains weak writing, grammatical errors, and typos, and does not provide examples of "wrong" centralized functions that "impair institutional agility." The action items bypass this evidentiary stage to recommend solutions to problems that are not concretely defined. The report is self-contradictory in the examples provided for effective collaboration and discourse as well as the hiring of outside consultants. There is also redundancy in our business efficiencies: Does UCLA need both Facilities and Cap programs (they are both construction things)? Purchasing and Strategic Sourcing (they are both buying things)? The Student Health Center and the Reagan Medical Center (they both provide medicine)? Main Campus and UNEX? Separate facilities for football and basketball (it's all sports). Those who appreciate the need for those apparent inefficiencies do not question them. Otherwise, in the name of business efficiencies, we subvert our valued cultural foundations.