Executive Summary

UC Berkeley is a place of remarkable discovery, creativity, and social mobility. Our strategic planning process presents an opportunity for the campus, as a community committed to shared governance and shared responsibility, to imagine the institution we want to be in ten years and beyond and to create a road map to that future. In light of recent challenges, as well as local and global trends, now is an important and exciting time to address Berkeley’s renewal and to expand its excellence.

To seize this opportunity, Chancellor Christ created four working groups to advise on key areas. Their recommendations are summarized in their individual reports. Taken together, these reports both identify key problems and issues that must be addressed as well as provide principles and broad frameworks for creating more specific solutions, the details of which will be developed in partnership with the administration, the Academic Senate, staff, students, alumni, and other campus stakeholders. While the working groups’ recommendations do not depict our future in detail, they do suggest overall directions and possible strategies to follow. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) **Identity-Making**: Build on Berkeley’s distinctive character and comprehensive academic excellence. Berkeley is distinguished by its combination of internationally recognized academic and research excellence across the full range of disciplines it offers; the transformative opportunity it provides to a large and diverse undergraduate and graduate student body; its public mission and commitment to equality and social justice; its practice of robust shared governance and responsibility; and its roots in the California experience, animated by such values as innovation, questioning the status quo, and respect for the environment and nature. Many research universities offer two of these features; a few offer three. But no other university combines them all. To attract the very best students, faculty, and staff and inspire and enlarge our community of supporters, Berkeley must articulate and build on the campus’s core values and strengths: we must “tell our story” in a fresh and compelling way that persuades people to tie their futures to our campus.

2) **Curricula for the Future**: Make our academic programs more flexible, fostering multi-disciplinarity and drawing on Berkeley’s comprehensive excellence. Berkeley should leverage its excellence across multiple academic and professional fields to develop new interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate pathways that enable students to pursue their academic passions, whether these fall neatly into an existing academic field or cut across several. To be sustainable for the future, we must increase flexibility without compromising rigor, and provide an education that prepares our students to meet the challenges of today as well as the as-yet-unknown challenges of the future.

3) **Student Success**: Create a community where all Berkeley students can thrive both academically and personally. Berkeley should be as renowned for the quality of its student experience as it is for its academic excellence. This begins with ensuring that all students have the basic resources (e.g., housing and financial support) and the academic support services they need to thrive. But it also includes curricular and co-curricular experiences that build our students’ capacity to discover, to lead, and to change the world.
4) **Signature Initiatives**: Develop comprehensive approaches—including research, teaching, and public service efforts—to solving the great challenges in society that Berkeley is particularly well-suited to address. These are not conceived as “moon shots” that “solve” problems and move on. Rather, they are complex, multi-faceted societal challenges to which Berkeley brings a particular combination of scholarly excellence, resources, and people that will allow us to serve our society and our world as well as to advance basic research and knowledge.

5) **Strength in Diversity**: Celebrate, embrace, and deliver on enhanced inclusion and diversity as central contributors to Berkeley’s distinctive excellence. Consistent with its origins as the public flagship university in one of the nation’s most diverse states, Berkeley should significantly increase our representation of minority, low-income, and first-generation college students, faculty, and staff. One measure of this will be to qualify for federal designation as an Hispanic-Serving Institution within ten years (which means at least 25% of our undergraduates would be Latinx). Enhancing our diversity will require expanding outreach, reexamining our admissions and hiring practices, and fostering a truly welcoming and inclusive campus culture for students, staff, and faculty.

6) **Expanding Access**: Pursue growth that expands opportunity and reinforces access to excellence. Berkeley should plan for gradual increases in undergraduate enrollment that are supported with appropriate facilities, faculty, and staff. Doctoral student education is critical to our excellence but growth must be accompanied with adequate financial support and aligned with career options. We must also pursue new opportunities to serve a broader group of Californians, including renewing a commitment to our community college transfer mission and growth in lifelong learning opportunities for our own alumni and the broader community.

7) **Sound Financial Management**: Adopt a more holistic and disciplined approach to making financial decisions. This means moving away from a historical legacy of tightly prescribed fund sources and toward approaches that consider all forms of revenue, net rather than gross income, and all costs—direct, indirect, and imputed. We must work as a team, employing shared governance to make more disciplined decisions and recognizing that going in new directions may require winding up old activities. We must be willing to invest in areas with greater long-term potential, even if, in the short run, this means larger cuts elsewhere.

8) **Trust-Based Ethos**: Increase transparency and reduce complexity; build revenues by methods consistent with our values. Berkeley must avoid the assumption of zero-sum budgets, discourage a hoarding mentality, and adopt funding allocation rules that are transparent, consistent, and accepted as fair. Recognizing that traditional forms of support are likely to grow more slowly than expenses, Berkeley must robustly pursue other revenue sources, become more disciplined in philanthropy, and strive to be as excellent in this and other mechanisms to increase revenue as we are in scholarship. Finally, we must support and encourage staff by recognizing their contributions and providing growth opportunities.
I. Introduction

2018 represents a milestone for Berkeley: as we celebrate the 150th anniversary of our founding, we look ahead beyond several challenging years and we are invigorated by new leadership and the excitement of charting a forward path. Now is a very good time to pause and imagine our future. In less than two years, the campus will publicly announce the launch of a major new fundraising effort, surely the largest and most ambitious we have ever taken on. In 2020, the campus’s Long Range Development Plan will sunset and be replaced with a new vision for the physical configuration of our campus. And the higher education landscape—particularly for public institutions—continues to evolve rapidly. These opportunities and conditions provide an ideal moment in which to carefully consider and articulate the Berkeley we want to be.

The Strategic Planning Process

Soon after she assumed the chancellorship in the summer of 2017, Chancellor Christ began speaking about the need for a strategic plan. In doing so, she cited all of the reasons listed above and her own desire for a road map that would aid campus leadership in making decisions over the next several years. In the spirit of shared governance and shared responsibility, she asked for a partnership between the Academic Senate and administration—with input from students, staff, and alumni—to develop a short and high-level framework that could be completed within a single academic year and whose primary recommendations could be encapsulated in just a few pages. She was also very clear about what she did not want: a 200-page document that cumulated a wish list drawn from every department chair and dean and that lacked a central set of themes and unifying narrative.

Following many conversations with key constituent groups, this planning process was launched in November 2017, with the appointment of Rich Lyons, Dean of the Haas School of Business, and Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, to serve as co-chairs of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. On November 21, 2017, the Chancellor hosted a retreat attended by members of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Council of Deans, and the leadership of the Academic Senate and the undergraduate and graduate student governments. After considering underlying principles and animating visions and conducting an analysis of campus strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, retreat participants discussed four central questions around which to organize the planning effort:

- **Signature Initiatives — What are the critical issues and challenges facing our state, our nation, and our world that Berkeley is particularly well suited to address?** Topics to be addressed: identification of “grand challenges” that Berkeley is particularly well suited to address; options for differential growth to support pursuit of these challenges; opportunities for increasing and leveraging interdisciplinarity; and the role and evolution of comprehensive excellence. (Note that in the initial phases of this work, this group and task was known as “Grand Challenges,” a title later changed because the Steering Committee felt it did not clearly describe its objectives.)
• **Student Experience** — What investments and changes in our instructional and co-curricular programs would have the greatest impact on the quality of our students’ experience? Topics to be addressed: curricular and co-curricular programs that would improve the experience of both undergraduate and graduate students (including post-doctoral scholars); specific issues (e.g., lack of housing) currently affecting students; creating a supportive and inclusive campus climate (including morale of staff, students, and faculty); and the role of technology in improving student outcomes and instructional quality.

• **Enrollment** — Accepting that enrollment growth is not entirely within the campus’s control, what do we see as the preferred enrollment level for Berkeley and how should this enrollment be distributed? Topics to be addressed: ideal size and rate of growth; student mix by level; diversity; infrastructure needed to support higher levels of enrollment; faculty needs to support enrollment, including mix of ladder and non-ladder faculty; and the role of technology and alternative education delivery models in accommodating increased demand and reaching out to new populations.

• **Financial Strategies** — How can Berkeley foster a sustainable financial model with an evolving diversity of revenue sources? Topics to be addressed: needs for capital vs. operating budget; fundraising; financial expectations, incentives, and fiscal discipline for individual units; role of professional schools; and role of self-supporting programs.

Following the retreat, participants as well as the Academic Senate and the student governments were asked to nominate potential members to serve on working groups to address these four questions. Names were received in December and the four working groups were populated and given their charges in early January. Consistent with Berkeley’s robust tradition of shared governance, each working group was co-chaired by a member of the administration (a dean or vice provost) and a representative of the Senate; members were drawn from faculty, administrative leadership and staff, and students. In addition, to provide overall leadership and direction and to ensure integration of the results of the separate working group efforts, the co-chairs of the four working groups made up the membership of the Steering Committee, together with its co-chairs Rich Lyons and Lisa Alvarez-Cohen as well as Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion Oscar Dubon, who was nominated to serve as an at-large member. (Rosters of the four working groups and the Steering Committee are available at strategicplan.berkeley.edu).

The Steering Committee and four working groups began meeting the week of January 8, 2018, and each met every other week from January through early April. Meetings of the Steering Committee and the working groups were staggered (that is, the Steering Committee met in the weeks the working groups didn’t, and vice versa) to allow for smooth interaction and flow of information among the working groups and the Steering Committee. This structure allowed issues that came up in the working groups to be elevated and discussed by the full Steering Committee before the next working group meeting and helped ensure that the groups stayed integrated, even though each was tackling a separate but interrelated set of questions.

Early in its work, the Steering Committee adopted four principles to guide its work:
1. Transparency — enable all to understand how decisions are being made
2. Integration of bottom-up with top-down thinking – facilitate the flow of ideas between faculty, students, staff, and administration
3. Pursuing the greater good – avoid parochial thinking
4. Intentional engagement – accept and provide honest feedback

Throughout the months from January through early April, the Steering Committee and the four working groups held extensive consultation sessions with key campus groups. These included two campus-wide town halls; multiple meetings with the Divisional Council as well as key Academic Senate committees and a special meeting of the full Berkeley Division; the campus-wide Chairs’ Forum; the Council of Deans; the Chancellor’s Cabinet; meetings of the ASUC Senate and Graduate Assembly as well as other student advisory groups; and organizations representing various staff groups as well as groups of staff organized around specific kinds of work (e.g., campus business officers, student advisors, etc.). Finally, members of the Steering Committee met on multiple occasions with the Berkeley Board of Visitors and committees of the Berkeley Foundation Board of Trustees (A full list of consultation sessions will be included in the appendix of the final report). Written input and ideas were also solicited and received from these organizations as well as from the community at large though a website – strategicplan.berkeley.edu – that allowed for direct input.

About This Report

This report contains summative conclusions and recommendations that rise above and cut across the work of the four working groups. It does not by any means cover all of the issues the groups addressed, but rather those that the Steering Committee felt were most essential. Nor does it describe in detail the full context and rationale for individual recommendations. For additional completeness and detail, readers should review the reports of the four individual working groups, preliminary versions of which will be available for campus review in May 2018.

This report and the underlying reports of the working group reports represent a milestone, but not a conclusion, for the campus’s strategic planning effort. These reports should still very much be considered as preliminary drafts—they represent the work to date of those who have been mostly closely involved in the effort to this point and they form a base for continued conversation. While the reports themselves will be finalized by the beginning of the summer, they are more a beginning than an ending. We envision robust campus conversation throughout the remainder of the Spring semester—as the reports are reviewed and revised—and into the fall, as the campus begins the process of evaluating different recommendations, deciding which should receive greatest priority, and developing implementation plans. As noted above, prioritization and implementation planning will be done in concert with planning for the next capital campaign and developing a new LRDP.

Finally, a word about what this plan is not: by design and at the request of the Chancellor, this plan does not include recommendations for organizational change or for allocation of faculty FTE and other resources. A number of its recommendations—including those that suggest new research and instructional programs—likely have implications for future resource allocation. But in our view, such decisions are premature. As campus conversations about the plan move forward and central priorities emerge and are confirmed, the campus will then turn to implementing the most important recommendations and strategic directions. Several of the key questions originally included in the charge language on page 2 and 3 will be addressed at that point. As noted above, we expect that process to begin in earnest at the beginning of the Fall 2018 semester and to continue throughout the 2018-19 academic year.
II. Overview of Key Recommendations

This report seeks to identify, from among the many detailed recommendations made by the four working groups charged with carrying out this first phase of the campus’s strategic planning, those that are most central, cross-cutting, and urgent.

1. **Identity-Making: Define and Leverage Berkeley’s Distinctive Character and Comprehensive Academic Excellence.**

150 years after its founding, UC Berkeley leads the nation’s universities—and, many would say, the world—in the excellence and comprehensiveness of its faculty and its academic programs. Its expansive scholarly excellence, combined with the committed embrace of its public mission, sets Berkeley apart from the nation’s other great research universities. But Berkeley’s distinctiveness goes beyond excellence in service to California and the public good. Consistent with its dedication to knowledge and learning and its founding as the flagship university of a state whose success still rests on its pioneering spirit, Berkeley has developed and transmits to its students a particular set of values: innovation, independence, tolerance, nonconformity, respect for nature and the environment, and regard for free speech as a central feature of a democratic society.

This theme undergirds the discussion and findings of all four working groups: Berkeley must articulate, celebrate, and reinforce the values and qualities that have made it (along with its sister campuses) a great asset to California and the world and continue to serve as an international model of exceptional teaching, research, and service conducted in an environment of shared governance and responsibility and in support of its public mission and its commitment to opportunity and social justice. This is key to the campus’s ability to continue to attract the very best students, faculty, and staff; to build a strong and supportive campus community; and to ensure that the members of this community—and the larger communities of which we are a part—see Berkeley as an ever-present resource and continue to identify with and support the campus throughout their lifetimes. People considering joining Berkeley—whether prospective students, faculty, or staff—are in essence asking themselves: Why should I tie my life to what Berkeley represents? We must articulate a compelling answer to that question.

An honest appraisal should begin by recognizing that the last few years have been difficult for Berkeley’s external identity and, in many ways, for its internal identity as well. As one person commented, “It’s take-back-the-narrative time.” Berkeley’s image is shaped not only by its illustrious past, but also by current events, not all of which reflect positively on the institution.

The first step in this process is to affirm the elements of Berkeley’s identity that most sharply distinguish it from other great universities. What qualities are we most proud of in our scholars, in our graduates? What are the qualities the future most needs? And do our answers pass the “why Berkeley and not others” test: that is, if we were to specify our definitional qualities, could we agree that the combined list does not equally well describe any of the other preeminent universities we consider to be our peers? Both the Student Experience and Signature Initiatives working groups addressed these questions directly, while also recognizing that we have much to learn from our peers.

The second step is then to build our future around this special identity, strengthening existing programs and evolving new ones that create educational paths that are most consistent with who we are and who
we want to be. For example, if comprehensive academic excellence is one of our distinguishing characteristics, we should build on that by pursuing signature initiatives that draw on our strengths in a breadth of different fields—some but not all of which can be found at other institutions—and intentionally supporting more interdisciplinary activities. (Critically important to our breadth are the talents of our staff as well as our faculty and students and world-class resources like Lawrence Berkeley Lab and our libraries, museums, and collections.) Similarly, if an essential part of our identity stems from our California roots, then we should prioritize qualities and academic areas consistent with those roots, e.g., diversity, innovation, environmental activism, globalism, etc. And finally, if recognition as the nation’s best public university is central to our identity, then we must consciously lead and model best practices for other universities, especially those dedicated to a public mission.

2. Curricula for the Future: Create new, flexible academic paths that foster multi-disciplinarity and draw on Berkeley's comprehensive excellence.

As noted above, excellence across a broad range of academic and professional endeavors has long been a hallmark of UC Berkeley and a characteristic that has attracted outstanding students, staff, and faculty. Not only do we have large numbers of disciplinary-focused undergraduate and graduate programs, we also have formal joint majors at the undergraduate level, concurrent graduate programs, and interdisciplinary doctoral and master’s programs, along with designated emphases. However, these cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary activities have their own approved curricula, and establishing (and disestablishing) academic programs is laborious and time-consuming. Berkeley should draw on its breadth and excellence in both academic and professional fields and the exceptional resources provided by its libraries, museums, collections, and laboratories (including Lawrence Berkeley Lab) to create new and more flexible paths through its curricula that respond to rapidly evolving student interests, labor markets, and the need for lifelong learning. Some compelling examples include:

- The ability for both undergraduates and graduate students to pursue more interdisciplinary work or work in more than one field—e.g., composite undergraduate majors that draw on our multiple departments and our outstanding professional schools (beyond our existing concurrent programs), and broadening of graduate programs in ways that are more flexible than current requirements for Designated Emphases or the formation of a graduate group.

- “3+2” and “4+1” programs that combine undergraduate and graduate education and offer Berkeley undergraduates the opportunity to earn both an undergraduate and a Masters degree in five years, as well as free-standing one- or two-year academic or professional Masters programs for graduates of other institutions who wish to pursue additional work in a chosen discipline. Berkeley has always been a campus of high achievers and we believe the opportunity for our undergraduates to earn two degrees (one at the graduate level) in five years will resonate strongly with many potential students. Such programs have the potential to address state goals for increasing degree production and could enhance graduate student diversity by attracting Berkeley undergraduates into non-doctoral graduate programs (with the hope that some will decide to continue to the doctorate). They could also open professional school training and experience to undergraduates studying humanities and social sciences.

- Expansion of high-quality online, summer, and off-campus programs that provide flexibility for students who wish or need to study off-campus and/or outside of the traditional academic year and for prospective transfer students.
• Exploration and potential expansion of nontraditional forms of enrollment such as certificate programs, degree completion programs, post-baccalaureate programs, and interdisciplinary B/MA or B/MS degrees in “Liberal Studies,” as well as more lifelong learning opportunities for our alumni and our broader community.

• Every undergraduate student’s time at Berkeley should include a discovery experience. Research, creativity, and discovery are key aspects of Berkeley’s character. Consistent with these values, every Berkeley undergraduate should have the opportunity to personally explore his or her own interests and talents beyond the traditional classroom. These projects can take many forms—traditional academic research, entrepreneurial endeavors, creative projects, or public service; they can be individual or group projects; and they can exist within or across traditional disciplines. The skills and self-knowledge that come with discovery experiences should be an essential part of the tool kit our students take with them when they graduate.

3. Student Success: Create a community where all Berkeley students can thrive both academically and personally.

If Berkeley is to be as renowned for the quality of its student experience as it is for the excellence of its research, all students should have the academic and personal support services and facilities they need to succeed academically. Most important among these are:

• Housing: We endorse full implementation of the January 2017 recommendations of the Housing Master Plan Task Force chaired by our current Chancellor. Noting that Berkeley currently houses only 22% of its undergraduates and 9% of its graduate students, the lowest in the UC system, the task force recommended a campus goal of housing about 50% of our undergraduates and 25% of our graduate students. This was estimated to require almost doubling the 2016 capacity of 8,700 beds to 15,600 beds; more capacity will be needed to achieve the goal if the campus expands enrollment.

• Financing: Adequate financial support for doctoral students is necessary to ensure that Berkeley remains competitive for the best graduate students and that they can complete their research in a reasonable time frame. Students should not be recruited into programs that cannot ensure adequate financial and faculty-mentoring support and reasonable job prospects upon completion of the degree. This recommendation likely implies differential growth among doctoral programs, though growth (or lack thereof) will be affected by many factors, including new research and instructional directions.

• Facilities: Modern academic and other facilities to respond to growth and ensure a high-quality experience for every student. In addition to housing, examples of campus priorities for facilities include a new classroom building, completion of the Moffitt Library renovation, renovation and expansion of student academic support spaces like those currently housed in the Cesar Chavez Center, and creation of additional state-of-the-art teaching laboratories. The vision that underlies our new Long-Range Development Plan can help create a more cohesive experience for our students by rationalizing the location of academic departments and programs and ensuring that all students have a home base from which to explore the intellectual riches the Berkeley campus offers.
• **Advising/Mentoring:** Advising and mentoring programs for both graduate students and undergraduates should be evaluated and expanded, so that students (including those entering Berkeley from under-resourced high schools or community colleges) have equitable access to these services and the time of professional staff and faculty is focused on the questions and cases that require their specific expertise. Programs such as “Berkeley Connect” can serve as a model of programs that should be available to more students. Fresh ideas for expanding capacity in this area that have shown good results when implemented in targeted ways (e.g., handling initial inquiries) include drawing on peer advisors (fellow undergraduate or graduate students), retired faculty, and, potentially, select alumni who can help provide a carefully articulated continuum of advising services, including post-graduation advice. Leveraging technology can also extend the reach and capacity of our advising corps.

4. **Signature Initiatives:** Develop comprehensive approaches—including research, teaching, and public service efforts—to solving the great challenges in society that Berkeley is particularly well-suited to address.

UC Berkeley is a vibrant international leader in public education and research achievement. Its faculty is first-rate across a broad set of disciplines that includes the arts and humanities, social sciences, biological and physical sciences, engineering, and a range of professional schools; its research and instructional programs are rooted in a deep commitment to its public mission; and its resources include enormously talented staff and world-class laboratories (including Lawrence Berkeley Lab), libraries, museums, and collections. Working together across disciplinary lines, the Berkeley campus should commit to pursuing a limited number of signature initiatives that sit at the intersection of Berkeley’s core values of comprehensive academic excellence and public service. Each of these should involve projects that cross disciplinary lines and embrace faculty, students, and staff from multiple backgrounds and perspectives—the arts, humanities, and social sciences as well as STEM and professional schools. And each should engage all of Berkeley’s defining missions, including research, teaching, public service, access, and diversity. Most important, each should be something that Berkeley is particularly well suited to address. Signature initiatives now recommended for consideration, based on broad input and extensive discussion, are listed below.

• **Inclusive Intelligence** – A new approach to artificial intelligence and Data Science that is: 1) inclusive of individuals from all backgrounds to benefit the greater good; 2) inclusive of a broad community of scholars from engineering, business, the arts, humanities, psychology, neuroscience, sociology, politics, philosophy, history, and other disciplines; and 3) inclusive of both human and artificial intelligence and the way they interact, complement, and enhance each other. This initiative will promote both continued technological innovation and a broad investigation of the societal and ethical implications of artificial intelligence, robotics, and data sciences.

• **Sustainability and Environmental Justice.** Many of the greatest economic, societal, and political challenges of our century revolve around environmental issues, including energy, climate change, water, land use and scarcity, food production, resource extraction, biodiversity loss, diseases, and human health. This initiative proposes a wide coordination of units—stretching from the humanities and social sciences to STEM and the professional schools—to examine,
predict, and mitigate these challenges, and in the process become an international leader in solution-based scholarship that fosters societal change.

- **Democracy, Values, Governance, and Freedom of Expression.** This initiative will stimulate a broad reflection on the values and conditions that enable democracy to flourish. All aspects of democratization must be considered in an age in which technology, wealth, globalization, political polarization, mass immigration, and inequality can pose challenges to democracy. Berkeley will lead in clarifying the future of democracy, its paths of evolution, and ways to preserve and enhance it.

- **Inequality and Opportunity.** Inequality is a defining issue of our time; it affects democratic participation, access to education, health, and wellbeing. As a world leader in studying the multiple dimensions of inequality, Berkeley's faculty, departments, and centers are uniquely equipped to develop policies to diminish inequality and broaden opportunity.

- **Charting a New Course to Health and Well-being.** Health is so much more than just the absence of disease. While 20% of the determinants of health are based on clinical interventions, the other 80% of influential forces include our social and economic contexts, time and place, our own behaviors, and the physical environment around us. Berkeley will chart a course to optimal wellbeing by maximizing innovation in life science discovery and minimizing barriers to equal access to health—integrating the full 100%.

- **Lighting the Way to the Public Research University of the Future.** As described in Section I above, on “Identity-Making,” Berkeley—in its 150th year—should devote itself to serving as an international model for the public research university of the future. This includes being the best we can be in all our endeavors, continuing to expand access and opportunity, telling the story of the value of public institutions in a time when the meaning and value of “public” has become tarnished, and helping to develop policies that will sustain public research universities into the future.

These six initiatives do not encompass all that Berkeley does, but they do provide a sense of its breadth, its commitment to dealing with fundamental issues, and its ability to spawn cultural, social, and technological innovations. They are all built upon the basic research that Berkeley does and nothing in this plan should be construed as weakening Berkeley’s commitment to basic research; rather our excellence in basic research is key to our ability to pursue these and other initiatives. At the same time, they provide touchstones for Berkeley researchers who want to initiate big projects, and they serve as exemplars of what Berkeley does for the world. They provide a way to bring interested members of our community together in new ways to re-envision the uses—borrowing from Clark Kerr’s celebrated phrase—to which Berkeley is put. For each of the six themes, the working groups have identified at least a dozen projects that might be undertaken. If a candidate project for a Signature Initiative does not attract enough faculty and students naturally interested in pursuing it, it is not a good choice. Hence, we expect the set of initiatives the campus ultimately takes on to evolve based on faculty and student interest.

5. **Strength in Diversity:** Celebrating, embracing, and delivering on enhanced inclusion and diversity as central to Berkeley’s distinctive excellence.
Consistent with its historic role as the flagship university in one of the nation’s most diverse states, Berkeley prides itself on providing life-changing opportunity to students from a very broad range of backgrounds. Diversity is a key value that must continue to animate all that we do.

- To enhance the quality of students’ academic and social experiences, better mirror the state’s population, create the most effective teams for research discovery, and continue to train leaders from all backgrounds and communities, Berkeley should commit to increasing its proportions of African Americans, Latinx, Native Americans, low-income students, and students in the first generation of their families to graduate from college. One marker of success in this arena will be for Berkeley to qualify for federal designation as an Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI)—which means 25% of our undergraduate population would be Latinx—within 10 years. (Latinx students currently comprise 51% of all high school graduates in California.) Continued growth in the undergraduate population is likely necessary—though not sufficient—to achieving these goals. A robust transfer population is also critical, as is reexamination of admissions procedures.

- Berkeley has opened up high-quality professional careers to future leaders from all backgrounds and has traditionally been among the nation’s largest producers of minority Ph.D.s. We have a responsibility to increase the engaged representation of minorities (and, in some cases, women) in our graduate programs and to help build the diverse faculty of the future.

- Similarly, growth in the numbers of underrepresented faculty is critical to the quality and relevance of Berkeley’s academic enterprise. Recognizing that faculty candidate pools are not always deep and that turnover amongst the faculty is slow, Berkeley should nonetheless pursue all possible means to increase the rate at which its faculty becomes more diverse.

- If Berkeley is to succeed in attracting and retaining larger numbers of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff, it must reexamine its admissions and hiring practices, intentionally create programs that will appeal to people from diverse backgrounds, and create a campus climate where all members of our community, regardless of their backgrounds, feel welcome, respected, and safe.


The campus should continue to grow in order to provide opportunity to more students, but growth should be differential across both levels and disciplines.

- To ensure that Berkeley continues to be an engine of opportunity and contributes to the state’s need for more highly skilled workers, undergraduate enrollment should increase. Berkeley should continue to prioritize and facilitate UC’s transfer mission, including identifying new ways to streamline transfer preparation pathways and to connect early with potential transfer students. Improving bachelor’s degree completion rates and time-to-degree should be an integral part of the strategy to increase degree production—though Berkeley’s strong current record on both of these measures means additional improvement may be modest. Growth in the student population should be accompanied by appropriate expansion of facilities, services, faculty and staff. Maintenance of an adequate faculty-student ratio is critical to our students’
success and the quality of their experience; we must not allow additional growth to further compromise this essential value.

- At the graduate level, we expect growth in selected professional and academic masters programs (including self-supporting programs and 3+2/4+1 programs). Growth in doctoral programs is appropriate when it supports continued academic quality and student success: Ph.D. enrollment may increase in fields with both a sufficient job market and adequate resources to ensure that we attract and fully support the best students. We should not make the assumption that growth in undergraduates or faculty requires proportional growth in doctoral students.

Berkeley anticipates continuing to offer instruction in a broad range of programs and increasing enrollment in fields that support emerging areas of research, instruction, and service. Hence, this plan does not contemplate eliminating any academic departments. But it does assume that remaining flexible and responsive to evolving trends means some will grow more quickly than others.

7. **Strong Financial Management**: Move toward a more holistic and disciplined approach to making financial decisions.

Our financial strategies must be focused on sustaining and promoting our academic mission. We are not raising money or cutting costs for their own sake, but in order to be able to support our research and teaching. To that end, our financial operations and health must be approached holistically—looking beyond traditional fund accounting to consider all forms of revenue jointly; considering net rather than gross income; looking at both direct and indirect or imputed costs when we think about expenses; and being willing to invest in areas with greater long-term potential, even if this means cutting in other areas. This means we must be more disciplined in our financial approach, setting clear priorities and sticking to them when we make financial decisions. Our practices must be predictable, transparent, and understandable. All of this will require careful reconsideration of all of our financial practices. For example, we may want to consider greater decentralization of certain decisions—recognizing that centralization remains appropriate in some cases.

8. **Trust-Based Ethos**: Increase transparency and reduce complexity; build revenues by methods consistent with our values.

Financial health requires changing both some of our culture and many of our practices. To move beyond a hoarding mentality and the assumption that the allocation of resources is a zero-sum game, we need increased trust and transparency, and we must reduce complexity (a theme echoed in many discussions beyond those focused on financial strategies). Rules by which funds are allocated need to be transparent, consistent, and perceived as fair.

While we must continue to advocate actively for increases in traditional forms of support such as tuition and state funding, these will likely grow more slowly than expenses. Therefore, we must also commit ourselves to the robust pursuit of other sources of revenue, including philanthropy, new forms of enrollment, and better monetization of resources like real estate and intellectual property. However, this must be done in a way that is consistent with Berkeley’s excellence in research and teaching and its commitment to public service. This requires re-thinking our current systems of “taxation” (the flow of funds from units back to the center) and how we provide incentives—in particular, ensuring that we strike the right balance between “keep what you reap” rules that encourage entrepreneurism and the
need to contribute to or common services and programs that benefit all. We must also become more disciplined in philanthropy, becoming as excellent in that endeavor as we are in scholarship. Similar excellence is needed in all our efforts to increase revenue. Finally, we must support and encourage staff by recognizing their contributions and providing growth opportunities.

III. Conclusions/Next Steps

As noted above, the campus’s strategic planning effort has reached a milestone, but it is far from over. In fact, this report and those of the individual working groups represent more of a beginning than a conclusion. We look forward to robust and substantial review and discussion over the rest of the 2018 calendar year. Implementation of some of the recommendations described here and in the working groups is in fact already under way. For many of the most high-priority recommendations, we hope implementation planning can begin in the summer of 2018, even as campus discussion about the details of our plans continues. Other recommendations will require a more deliberative and phased implementation plan. The key, however, is that as these discussions move forward and as planning gives way to implementation, we know the directions in which we want to go and we work together as a community toward a future of continued distinction, excellence, and opportunities for all.