The Uses of the Public University in 2050: Faculty Charrette Summary Report

Thursday, February 23 - Sunday, February 26, 2012
The Uses of the Public University in 2050:
Faculty Charrette Summary Report
Thursday, February 23 - Sunday, February 26, 2012
**Table of Contents**

**Executive Summary**

1. **Introduction** ..........................................................................................................................1
   A. Project Overview

   B. Charrette Format

2. **Designing our Ideal Future: A Vision of What Should Be** ..................................................8
   A. Connecting the Past: Tapping our Personal Educational Experiences

   B. The Mission of the University

   C. The Foundation for Designing the Ideal Public University for the 21st Century

3. **Moving Toward the Vision: 12 Design Principles** .................................................................13

4. **Building the Momentum for Change** ..........................................................29
   A. Aligning Faculty and Building a Movement

   B. Immediate Next Steps

Appendix ........................................................................................................................................32
Executive Summary

A Mission Statement for the Public University

Education is a public good, not a private benefit. It should be treated as a resource, not a commodity. The notion of a public good is the foundation of the University of California (UC), and directs all of its activities. As a public good, education deserves the support of the State of California. A UC education should be an affordable resource for all qualified citizens of the State. The University is a place for teaching and learning, research and public service. Here, citizens are formed by teaching and scholarship that is truthful, challenging, and inspired. At the UC, research enriches teaching, which in turn enriches research.

Academic freedom—that is, the freedom of inquiry and expression by students and faculty members—is essential to support the research and teaching mission of the University.

The University is a place for ideas and discovery, with the goal of improving social welfare, locally and globally. Fundamental to the mission of the public university is to teach the ability to discover, provide access to the tools for discovery, and discover and nurture talent in all of California’s diverse communities.

The University conducts research that supports and expands the California economy. At the same time, the University moves beyond the immediate needs of the market economy and is not governed by its priorities. In the words of UC President Gilman from 1872, the University of California is “of the people and for the people”—not in any low or unworthy sense, but in the highest and noblest relations to their intellectual and moral well-being.” Nearly a century later, Earl Warren affirmed that the state’s investment in the University of California represents “an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy and peace.”

From Thursday, February 23 through Sunday, February 26, 2012, thirty-three faculty members from across the UC system met at UC Santa Barbara to explore the issues and opportunities faced by the system today. The goals of the meeting were: a) to create a new format in which scenarios for the UC's future can be articulated, debated and engaged; b) to cultivate fresh strategic thinking about our institution; c) to foster a conversation about the future that is driven by long-term vision rather than short-term crises; and d) to harness the power of the university’s best asset—faculty research expertise—to address the University’s future.

Our title, “The Uses of the University in 2050”, refers to Clark Kerr’s book The Uses of the University, first published in 1963. Our event thus hearkens back to a time when the UC had great clarity about its institutional vision. The charrette asked whether the “multiversity,” as imagined by Clark Kerr, is still viable in an era when public education is no longer seen as an absolute public good. If we were able to design from scratch a UC system for the year 2050, what would it look like?

The “mission statement” that opens this document derived from consensus among the participants as to values that the UC must maintain. However, the twelve “design principles” that subsequently emerged from discussion of the mission statement are not consensus items. By not enforcing strict consensus within the report, our hope is to create a document that will record the ideas of all participants and in doing so promote a continuing iterative process of generation, selection and refinement.

The twelve design principles are:

1. **Public responsibility**: In 2050, the University of California must deliver on the promises that have been made to the public, its primary constituency.

2. **A system of campuses**: In 2050, the University of California should remain a multi-campus system with common foundations and individual centers of excellence.

3. **A new model of change management**: In 2050, change within the UC system must be led by stewards, facilitators and collaborators dedicated to serving the public and to running the UC as a public university.

4. **Meeting the needs of a diverse California**: In 2050, the UC system should serve all of California’s diverse communities and play to the strengths of a range of talents, perspectives and ways of learning.
5. **Teaching and research as the anchor:** In 2050, UC must be characterized by instructional practices (including teaching, research collaborations, and other activities) grounded in an atmosphere of inquiry, discovery, knowledge and stewardship.

6. **A focus on the grand challenges and on serving the public good:** As a public system, the University must frame and respond to grand challenges facing California and the world.

7. **A dynamic, integrated, project-based curriculum:** In 2050, a project-based approach to teaching and learning will be one of many approaches to instruction, intellectual exploration and applied learning; this approach will help instill a passion for discovery in students and faculty alike.

8. **Evolving disciplines:** By 2050, flexible departmental and organizational structures will enable and encourage faculty-driven collaborations.

9. **Multiple forms of instruction, learning and teaching:** In 2050, teaching and learning must take various forms, ranging from spellbinding lectures to intensive seminars to one-on-one tutoring to virtual classroom experiences.

10. **Campus as place and non-place:** In 2050, UC campuses will offer a variety of physical and virtual settings, as well as fixed and flexible spaces that inspire social learning, collaborative inquiry, and a sense of ownership and stewardship of the campus shared by students, faculty and staff.

11. **A flexible reward structure:** In 2050, promotion decisions should allow flexibility for professors who at various points in their career devote extra time to teaching, University service or public service.

12. **Re-affirmation of core values:** In 2050, education must be understood and acted upon as a public good, not a commodity. Creativity in research and teaching protected by academic freedom will remain central to the University's mission.
Introduction
A. Project Overview

Public goods in California are imperiled. The University of California (UC), as a public institution, is no exception. While there have been fiscal emergencies throughout the UC's 144-year history, the present crisis is of historic proportions, with some promoting schemes for privatization or calling for disaggregation of campuses and schools. How the UC weathers this epoch will have profound implications for the future of the State of California and public institutions across America.

In response to this crisis, we propose a new, collaborative, multidisciplinary format to address important questions about the UC's future. This process is designed to harness the power of one of the University's greatest assets: the ingenuity of its faculty.

In February 2012, faculty from across the University of California convened for an intensive three-day "charrette" (defined below) at UC Santa Barbara to explore the following overarching questions:

- Is the “multiversity,” as imagined by Clark Kerr in the mid-60's, still viable in an era when public education is no longer seen as an absolute public good?
- If we were able to design a UC system for the year 2050 from scratch, what would it look like?

This project is a prototype of a new process for engaging faculty in imagining and designing the University’s role in California’s future. Our inspiration is two-fold: First, this project builds upon the thirty-year history of annual All-UC faculty conferences. Beginning in 1944, the UC hosted an annual system-wide conference on the future of the University in which over 100 faculty members would come together for a three-day workshop. They would tackle a particular issue of long range significance such as “The Post-War University,” which was the theme of the first conference in 1944. Convened by the Academic Senate and sponsored by the UC President, these events culminated in a work product with
recommendations, some of which went on to have substantive impacts in terms of policy and planning.\textsuperscript{2} Our charrette calls for a revival of this tradition, and at the same time represents an update to the process by using more contemporary planning methodologies. While higher education traditionally uses linear planning and decision-making models, these assume a degree of predictability that is uncommon today. This project experiments with the “charrette” method, an iterative process that—like scenario planning, visioning, open space technology and “skunk works”—is often used in product design, urban design and organizational brainstorming.\textsuperscript{3}

Charrettes get their name from the carts used at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris in the nineteenth century. At the end of the day, carts (or charrettes) would come around to collect designs from student architects. Some of them were so intensively engaged in their work that they would continue to design as the cart moved en route to their professors. Modern design charrettes connote an intense, short, focused working period that brings together people of different disciplines, backgrounds and vested interests. The charrette is a dynamic planning process that is intensely collaborative, holistic and responsive to a community.

The goals of the UC Santa Barbara charrette were: a) to create a new format in which scenarios for the UC’s future may be openly articulated, debated and engaged; b) to cultivate among faculty members fresh strategic thinking about our institution; c) to foster a conversation about the UC’s future that is driven by long-term vision rather than short-term crises; and d) to harness the power of faculty research expertise to address the real world problem of our University’s future. In short, we aim to use the University itself to help frame and address the University’s challenges.

\textsuperscript{2} An overview of these conferences and their topics can be found at http://townsendlab.berkeley.edu/making-uc-futures/files/overview-all-uc-faculty-conferences-archives.

B. Charrette Format

From Thursday, February 23 through Sunday, February 26, 2012, thirty-three faculty members from across the UC system met at UCSB to explore the issues and opportunities faced by the system today, and to begin to construct an agenda for action. Over the course of the charrette, participants worked intensively in three groups to define and begin to address key challenges the UC system now faces. Three working groups debated and explored answers to a series of guiding questions, articulated key characteristics of the University of California in 2050, and began to identify and design a first series of steps towards that vision. Following each break-out session, working groups reconvened to present and discuss their results to the whole group. All working group and plenary discussions were recorded by MIG, Inc. facilitators with diagrammatic wall graphics, which are included in this report.

Ideas were organized according to the following process-generated major themes:

- Designing our Ideal Future: A Vision of What Should Be
- Moving Toward the Vision: 12 Design Principles
- Building the Momentum for Change

For the complete charrette agenda, please see Appendix A.4

The process began with creating a “mission statement” derived from consensus among the participants as to the values that the UC must maintain. For the most part, however, rather than reflecting complete consensus among participants, this document represents a diversity of ideas and insights. Some suggestions reflect the perspectives of a few rather than many, while other suggestions may contradict or move in opposite directions. In organizing this charrette, we spoke with many people who had previously participated in the UC Commission on the Future (2010), and we often heard from them that the best ideas generated in the working groups of commission ended up “on the cutting room floor.” By not enforcing strict consensus within the following report, our hope is to record the range of ideas that emerged in the charrette and to create an intervention that itself will be part of a larger iterative process.

4 The schedule varied slightly from the exact schedule presented in the proposed agenda.
of generation, selection and refinement. For the sake of clarity, faculty suggestions and recommendations are often presented using directive, action-oriented language. Frequently, items that met with greater agreement are reiterated throughout the report.

One very large and significant omission of charrette was the discussion of finances. An assumption of this project has been that, while financial issues are some of the greatest challenges that the UC presently faces, our challenges as an institution actually far surpass money alone. The University of California is at a crossroads in terms of its institutional vision. Our title, “The Uses of the University in 2050”, references Clark Kerr’s book *The Uses of the University*, first published in 1963, and thus hearkens back to a time when the UC had great clarity about its institutional vision. In preparation for the charrette, we revisited that UC history to understand better the foundations of the institution we’ve inherited, and also to reflect critically on some of the potential flaws in that foundation, or ways in which this inherited structure may need to be changed.

5 Most participants agreed that UC should be free or at least affordable to qualified applicants. Many endorsed a funding plan proposed by Professor Stanton Glantz of UCSF. Glantz argues that it would not be prohibitively expensive for average taxpayers if the state were to restore funding to the entire higher education system, from community colleges to UC’s graduate programs, through taxation. According to Glantz’s estimates, restoring funding to 2000 levels would cost the median tax return $49. Details are available at http://keepcaliforniaspromise.org/2066/restore2011-12. Some participants disagreed, and opposed including Glantz’s proposal in this report.
While part of our process was to look several decades into the past, we also invited participants to project forward into the future, with a greater horizon in expectation than our present crisis has tended to produce. The year 2050 was in many ways symbolic, serving as beacon for a kind of expansive vision that was once a defining feature of the UC but that often feels quite difficult to perceive in the midst of our current crises. However, we strongly believe that such an expansive vision is essential if the University of California is to make our future and make it in ways that will justify a renewal of California’s commitment to and investment in public higher education. When the State’s economy recovers, the University of California will need to make a persuasive case for public reinvestment in the UC system. This charrette and its report are intended as catalysts for helping all stewards of the University of California make, remake, and renew the compelling vision that is at the center of our institution.
Designing our Ideal Future:
A Vision of What Should Be
2A. Connecting the Past: Tapping our Personal Educational Experiences
During Friday's opening work session, participants were asked to recall one of their more profound educational experiences and to describe this experience to the group. This activity resulted in rich conversation and demonstrated the power of education to captivate imaginations and inspire great thinking and action.
Common to all three group accounts, anecdotes and personal experiences were the following:
- An inspiring teacher who presented exciting ideas, often in dramatic fashion.
- Hands-on, real world projects, including the application of new concepts, tools and materials.
- A social experience of teaching and learning together with peers.
- An inspiring physical campus with access to faculty, students and resource materials in an environment conducive to learning and creative thought.

B. The Mission of the University
Working first in small groups, charrette participants explored the fundamental purpose of the public university. Specifically, they sought to answer the questions:
- Why does the public university exist?
- What are its roles and functions?
The following is a composite of the three group responses to these questions. While many participants acknowledged the clear connections and congruencies between the many mission areas of the public university, some suggested that the purposes of the public university today often conflict in philosophy and practice.
A Mission Statement for the Public University

Education is a public good, not a private benefit. It should be treated as a resource, not a commodity. The notion of a public good is the foundation of the University of California (UC), and directs all of its activities. As a public good, education deserves the support of the State of California. A UC education should be an affordable resource for all qualified citizens of the State. The University is a place for teaching and learning, research and public service. Here, citizens are formed by teaching and scholarship that is truthful, challenging, and inspired. At the UC, research enriches teaching, which in turn enriches research.

Academic freedom—that is, the freedom of inquiry and expression by students and faculty members—is essential to support the research and teaching mission of the University.

The University is a place for ideas and discovery, with the goal of improving social welfare, locally and globally. Fundamental to the mission of the public university is to teach the ability to discover, provide access to the tools for discovery, and discover and nurture talent in all of California’s diverse communities.

The University conducts research that supports and expands the California economy. At the same time, the University moves beyond the immediate needs of the market economy and is not governed by its priorities. In the words of UC President Gilman from 1872, the University of California is “of the people and for the people”—not in any low or unworthy sense, but in the highest and noblest relations to their intellectual and moral well-being.” Nearly a century later, Earl Warren affirmed that the state’s investment in the University of California represents “an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy and peace.”

C. The Foundation for Designing the Ideal Public University for the 21st Century

A place for knowing and learning
The University is a place for the creation and preservation of knowledge, and for teaching and learning at the highest levels. The University is a community of inquiry where students meet to develop ideas, both conservative and radical. Here, thinking is “big” and innovation thrives. At the same time, the importance of developing core skills and educating Californians to be informed, ethical citizens should be highly valued and a central component of the University’s mission.

A place for cross-disciplinary innovation
The University provides an ideal environment for proactive, cross-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary thought that moves beyond the traditional divide between the sciences and the humanities. Collaboration occurs and is initiated at all levels and in all directions. Collaboration is frequently “bottom up,” and lateral and vertical relationships abound.
The University is a place for public and community service. Here, we address challenges and find solutions of all scales, including solutions to grand challenges of the global scale. To meet these challenges, disciplines frequently interact, new fields are created, and strong connections to other institutions are built and nurtured.

A place of service and stewardship
The public university operates in a larger cultural setting and serves a unique and unparalleled social, civic and cultural purpose. Most notably, it provides access to opportunity for citizens of the State of California. Fairness, transparency, proximity, and affordability are vital in this regard. The University must be responsive to changing demographics, and should actively create connections and linkages to the communities it serves.
Charrette participants engaged in active thought and debate to explore future models for UC governance, funding and public accountability. In so doing, a series of twelve fundamental principles for design of the public multiversity emerged. These principles reaffirm the strength of existing UC values, and include new concepts and statements that charrette participants are eager to advance. This section of this report outlines the twelve design principles and summarizes group, as well as individual, findings related to each principle.
Design Principles for the Public Multiversity (2012-2050)

1. Public responsibility
2. A system of campuses
3. A new model of change management
4. Meeting the needs of a diverse California
5. Teaching and research as the anchor
6. A focus on the grand challenges and serving the public good
7. A dynamic, integrated, project-based curriculum
8. Evolving disciplines
9. Multiple forms of instruction, learning and teaching
10. Campus as place and non-place
11. A flexible reward structure
12. Re-affirmation of core values
1. Public responsibility
The University of California must deliver on the promises made to the public, its primary constituency. To do so, it is critical that its models of governance and funding are based on a renewed mission and dedication to create citizens through affordable, state-supported higher education, and to conduct socially responsive and responsible research.

Exploring the Possibilities
Charrette participants suggested the following models and approaches related to this design principle:

Funding quality education. Adopt a new public funding model that improves educational quality and access. If it is to remain a public good that serves the needs of California and the world, the University must remain a publically-funded institution.

Ethos of stewardship. Instill and model an ethos of stewardship for the State of California, its lands, and its people. Renew the UC commitment to create citizens of the world, as opposed to simply selling students the opportunity for greater future compensation.

Research design. Unless it is done in a proprietary way, research is a public good. Ensure, through public funding, that pure and applied research thrive and continue to serve the public good.

Advocacy. The University must advocate for its public role and for adequate public financing.

2. A system of campuses
The University of California must remain a multi-campus system with common foundations and individual centers of excellence. Participating faculty members envision a strong, expanded UC system in 2050 with the appropriate required funding models, structures of government and types of leaders.

Exploring the Possibilities
Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Consistent policies. Maintain consistent fees and uniform personnel policies across University centers.

Lateral connections. Expand formal and informal connections across campuses to achieve a variety of
objectives, and most notably to strengthen the system’s ability to advance the critical concepts outlined in this report. Strengthen intercampus connections through the use of new and advanced technologies.

Campus distribution. Think long-term about the needs of the State in order to determine how many UC campuses will need to be built in the future. The expansion of the system of higher education that was spelled out in the Master Plan should accurately reflect and respond to the educational needs of the State. It should not be driven by short-sighted political agendas.

UC Regents. Re-evaluate the purpose and qualifications of the UC Regents. Create a Board of Regents consistent with the requirements of the California constitution; this Board should be formed of representatives of the people of California, alumni and members of the UC community and should embody the ideal of higher education as a public good and the “one university” concept. The board should advocate for the University with the public and with political leaders.

Best practice dissemination. Create a UC system planning function that reviews and shares best practices for space and planning across the campuses.

Multi-campus research groups. Use technology to facilitate collaborative, multi-campus research.

Work space for system innovation. Establish a space on every campus for faculty to explore scenarios and to develop prototype models for the future University.

3. A new model of change management

In 2050, change within the UC system must be led by stewards, facilitators and collaborators dedicated to serving the public and to running the UC as a public university. Determining the system’s future funding model is paramount, as is actively planning for change in light of the greater world context.

Exploring the Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Collaborative planning. Make planning for the future an organic part of our work as faculty. Institutionalize the strategic visioning and planning process. Expand beyond this group. Maintain strong faculty involvement. Seek out and consider outside perspectives.

Student involvement. Teach undergraduates about the institution.

Office of the President. Re-evaluate the purpose and qualifications of the Office of the President (UCOP).
Transform the UCOP mission from management to facilitation so that the Office works on behalf of campuses, and not the other way around. Consider ways to strengthen UCOP’s connection to the campuses.

Professional and extracurricular programs. In light of resource constraints, re-evaluate the role of UC intercollegiate athletics and professional schools. How does each serve the UC’s overall mission?

Labor and governance. Resist the dual labor systems (Senate and non-Senate) in which Senate faculty are being replaced with casual, soft-money, non-Senate faculty who are expected to meet all the responsibilities of Senate faculty with none of the protections or security. Existing non-Senate faculty should be provided with reasonable salaries, benefits and opportunities for security of employment and professional development.

Governance: Strengthen faculty participation in the Senate system. Encourage faculty to take on administrative jobs within their campuses and across the system.

Compensation. Make executive-level compensation comparable to that of public servants in similar positions outside the University.

Process documentation. Produce a report that presents alternative models of governance, funding and accountability. Explore alternative scenarios and pose further questions.

4. Meeting the needs of a diverse California

In 2050, the UC system must serve all of California’s diverse communities and play to the strengths of a range of talents, perspectives and ways of learning. Embracing and leveraging geographic, ethnic and cultural diversity are paramount, as is UC’s ability to serve students diverse in age, lifestyle and professional path (including, for example, “second chance” students).

Exploring Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Tuition. Consider eliminating tuition entirely by increasing state taxes. Participants urged, that in making the case for state support to the legislature and the public, the University point out the disparity between the state’s fiscal wealth and economic growth, and its low ranking for investment in education. As much
as it is a question of revenue, funding for education is a question of priorities. Most agreed that restoring state funding to UC is essential if it is to serve the needs of a diverse California. (A few participants felt that state divestment from education is inevitable while others argue that it is precisely such presumptions of divestment that serve as a self-fulfilling prophesy).

Assessment of need. Conduct an environmental study of the needs of the state to better understand the future level of education need as it relates to the State’s geography (population composition, distribution, natural environment, etc.).

Free online instruction. Leverage existing instruction by using digital channels to share instruction online, or via UCTV. Following the examples of similar courses at Harvard and MIT, these courses should be free and open to the public.

Campus extensions. Expand the system of extension locations, which improve geographic access to education and appeal to students of many stripes.

Develop structures and programs that support life-long learning. Opportunities for continuing education can serve the needs of citizens who will pursue several different vocations in the course of their lifetime, as well as the needs of older citizens who desire access to UC courses, programs and degrees.

5. Teaching and research as the anchor

In 2050, UC must be characterized by an atmosphere of inquiry, discovery, knowledge and stewardship. Learning inspires students to pose urgent and original questions and takes place in an active, social setting.

In the public multiversity in 2050:

- UC invests in pure and applied research.
- Academic freedom is cherished.
- Faculty are appropriately rewarded through the Academic Personnel system for their contributions to research, teaching and mentoring.
- The value of research does not outweigh the value of teaching and learning.
- Students are actively engaged in their education, including research curriculum and project design.
Exploring the Possibilities
Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Research: The UC must continue to encourage and support pure as well as applied research.

Academic freedom: Academic freedom is essential to both teaching and research. “Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning.”

Investments in teaching. Strengthen the system’s focus on high quality teaching. Find ways to encourage professors to invest in teaching and learning.

The value of pedagogy. Strengthen pedagogical research and knowledge among faculty.

Rewards for teaching and mentoring. Give professors credit in the review process for exceptional teaching as one way of embedding research and creative activity within classes.

Personalized curriculum. Increase the participation of undergraduate and graduate students in development and refinement of course curriculum. Facilitate personalization of curriculum.

General education. Re-focus general education requirements on conceptual, problem-solving and writing skills, and critical approaches to civics, the humanities, the arts and the sciences.

6. A focus on the grand challenges and serving the public good
In the public multiversity in 2050, students should be informed, ethical and critical. As a public system, the multiversity helps to frame and respond to grand challenges facing California, the nation and the world, such as food, water, poverty, disease, population, climate, energy, improving education, finding models of organizational effectiveness in the developing world, disarmament, and solutions to inter-communal violence. Initiatives would be chosen for their research value, social value and “fit” with UC strengths and

would be designed in consultation with the public, with corporations in pivotal research areas, and with national and private funding entities.

Exploring the Possibilities
This was one of the most controversial proposals to emerge in the charrette. Many observed that such approaches to setting research priorities have historically not succeeded, and that this top-down model moved away from the charrette’s principles of “bottom-up” planning. Several pointed out that UC already has mechanisms, such as multi-campus and campus ORUs that address many of these grand challenges. The charrette working group that proposed this design principle used the basic concept from the UC Commission on the Future Research Strategies Working Group as a starting point for the idea of establishing the “Grand Challenges Research Initiatives” Program.

Revisions and additions to the original Commission on the Future concept include the following:
Bottom-up design. Selection of “grand challenges” should emerge from faculty, in partnership with students.
Incentives. An incentive structure should drive identification, definition and proposal of “grand challenges”. For example, make UC stimulus funds available for proposals and related programming and curricular development.
Student participation. Make undergraduate research and internships part of the grand challenge framework. Offer pre-admission for students entering programs linked to grand challenge initiatives.
Program integration. Embed research initiatives locally within existing departmental structures or through development of a special track for students. Consider using the summer season to host events and advance innovations in research, teaching and program development.
7. A dynamic, integrated, project-based curriculum

In 2050, a project-based approach to teaching and learning should be one of many approaches to instruction, intellectual exploration and applied learning that instills a passion for discovery in students and faculty alike. The focus should not be on the end-product (e.g., “portfolios”) but on the design of innovative and collaborative teaching and research experiences. Participation in a collaborative project could be imagined as a system-wide capstone requirement for undergraduates. During this experience, students could develop a cohesive set of skills and learn and apply concepts as they direct their energies towards achieving a shared goal.

Exploring the Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Co-teaching/co-learning. Initiate process-focused co-teaching/co-learning experiences, where undergraduate class faculty and students are co-engaged in research. Create opportunities for students to design courses in association with a mentor or professor.

Participants. Accommodate outside experts, mature students, and collaborations between undergraduates and graduate students. A capstone requirement could be developed for undergraduates to participate in a collaborative project.

System-wide participation. This could be a system-wide initiative. Projects created at one campus could be critiqued by faculty at other UC campuses.

Program flexibility. Disciplines could define this approach differently, which would allow students to satisfy the goal of creating collaborative, project-oriented learning experiences in different ways.
8. Evolving disciplines

Academic disciplines of the future public university are anticipated to change over time as the nature of our societal problems, our systems, and our thinking continues to evolve. By 2050, faculty-driven collaborations should be enabled and encouraged through flexible departmental and organization structures in order to maximize the UC’s ability to respond and adapt effectively to new challenges. Departmental structures have traditionally been organized by disciplines, and they have been responsive to disciplinary changes. As disciplines change, UC faculty and students must shape the discussion about the creation and evolution of departments; affected faculty and students should actively examine intellectual developments and rationales for change, rather than simply allowing cost-driven rationales to direct reconfiguration of departments.

Exploring the Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

*Departmental flexibility.* As disciplines evolve and change as a result of changing research priorities, the UC in consultation with the faculty must be able to adapt administrative and departmental structures to accommodate these changes. Faculty should be encouraged to rethink the rationale and shape of disciplines and departments. Rethink the larger structures that relate departments and disciplines, so that, for example, faculty and graduate students might be anchored in multiple units on campus. Faculty members should challenge the administrative barriers that prevent this kind of multidisciplinary appointment.

*Collaboration across fields.* Create greater opportunity for fluid and formal horizontal, vertical and “bottom up” collaborations within and among disciplines.

*Clusters of teaching and learning.* In 2050, UC will likely require greater organizational flexibility to cluster faculty and graduate students, as many graduate students may be funded by both a home department and a project.
9. Multiple forms of instruction, learning and teaching

In 2050, teaching and learning will take various forms. Instruction will be creative and innovative, and will range from spellbinding lectures to intensive seminars to one-on-one tutoring to virtual classroom experiences.

Exploring the Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

Open classrooms. Think differently about time and space as they relate to methods of instruction. Establish open classrooms such as those modeled through the University of California Institute for Research in the Arts.

Learn by doing. Strengthen and expand project-based learning and internship opportunities. Embed projects in courses. Initiate community-based learning activities with students.

Innovation institutes. Consider establishing innovation institutes based on the German model. Institutes would be ad hoc, and based on project and participant needs and directions.

Research-based learning. Bring questions to students that you the teacher do not know the answers to. Ask careful questions about the role, priority and implications of this approach vis-a-vis creative and innovative teaching.

Student involvement in research. Identify the obstacles that prevent greater involvement of students in faculty research and seek/implement solutions. Learn more about student demand for these opportunities and the value students place on participatory research.

Hybrid methods. Strengthen both research and teaching by bringing them together. Encourage experimental use of hybrid approaches to learning, research and instruction.
10. Campus as place and non-place

In 2050, UC campuses will offer a variety of physical and virtual settings, as well as fixed and flexible spaces that inspire social learning, collaborative inquiry, and a sense of ownership and stewardship of the campus shared by students, faculty and staff. Fixed and flexible spaces and the creative uses of information technologies should facilitate collaboration, convergence and divergence of thinking, the intersection of disciplines, formation of student groups and project teams, as well as innovation in UC governance.

Exploring the Possibilities

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

“The virtual extension.” Couple virtual learning closely with place-based learning. In order to do this, articulate the unique rationale for place-based learning in the future and the unique rationale for virtual learning. Develop alternative scenarios for adding scalable virtual learning to place-based learning and research.

Public knowledge and networking. Think proactively about the future of expert/academic knowledge in a new world of networked public knowledge. Invent new institutional practices, reward structures, and technologies to position UC work in the new world of public knowledge.

Flexible buildings and spaces. Assess the need for flexible, interdisciplinary buildings. Explore the “community table” idea, in which spaces and usages break down vertical and lateral stratification between faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students. Create “collision spaces”: spaces that are “slightly off the path, but not in the trail” and equipped with marker boards, chairs and coffee.

Classrooms. Provide greater diversity of classroom sizes. Larger classrooms with flexible seating are especially needed. Balance centrally-controlled and locally-controlled classrooms.

Technology integration. Provide/update technology in the classrooms so it is integrated with support, administrative, intellectual property and other structures on campus.

A new generation of digital information technology. Develop a new generation of digital information technology
that automatically captures, aggregates and repurposes the teaching and research done currently, including self-study.

*The residential campus.* Maintain the model of residential campuses with strong intercampus connections. Alternatively, consider reinventing the residential college model as an experiment.

11. **An expanded reward structure**

In 2050, there should be multiple pathways for faculty promotion and advancement. UC’s structure of rewards and promotions must support the design principles outlined in this document.

**Exploring the Possibilities**

Charrette participants suggested the following alternative models and approaches related to this design principle:

*Tenure.* Tenure should reward teaching and service as much as it does research. It must continue to protect academic freedom.

*Performance evaluation.* Build in greater flexibility in evaluating faculty performance in the four areas of review (teaching, research, service and professional activity) as proposed by Karl S. Pister in his “Task Force on Faculty Rewards” (1992). Merit and promotion decisions should allow flexibility for professors who devote extra time to teaching, University service or public service at various points in their careers.

*Teaching evaluation.* Less emphasis should be placed on student evaluations. (Some suggested that they should be eliminated entirely.) More emphasis should be placed on innovative modes of instruction and excellence in teaching through peer evaluation of teaching, the review of syllabi, PowerPoint presentations, and other classroom materials, and the establishment of departmental learning outcomes. Teaching performance should be examined carefully at critical stages: hiring, third-year evaluation, and tenure.

*Rewards:* Excellent teachers should be recognized by awards, special lectures, colloquia, etc.

*Equity:* Ensure equitable pay scales, benefits and rewards across campuses, disciplines and the system.

*Contingent labor:* The University must be staffed by line faculty. Contingent faculty should not take the place of faculty FTE.

*Peer review:* Protect faculty peer review, and restore and maintain the system-wide step system.
12. Reaffirmation of core values

The core values of the University of California should be carefully revisited and re-affirmed in the coming months and years. Creativity in research and teaching protected by academic freedom will remain foundational to the University’s mission. While many of the core values are inherent in the principles expressed above, values that met with broad agreement are noted below.

Exploring the Possibilities

In order to fulfill the mission of the public multiversity in 2050, the following values must be re-affirmed and reflected in the management and evolution of the UC system:

The University as an engaged site of research, teaching, and learning. The essential anchors of the University of California are pure and applied research, and engaged teaching and learning.

The future of research. The research enterprise should not be driven by income or profit. Research growth should be based on intellectual developments and programmatic decisions, not on short-term funding opportunities.

The future of teaching and learning. Efforts to bring knowledge about effective teaching to the faculty and to improve practice based on research-based experimentation will be vital to the future development of the public multiversity.

Education as a public good. Knowledge is a public good. It should be treated as a resource, not a commodity. Higher education is a necessary public good that the state is obligated to provide.

Academic freedom. Creativity, academic freedom and freedom to critique are central to the University’s mission. The UC must provide an environment that encourages and supports intellectual risk-taking. Scholars pursuing unusual or unpopular ideas should be protected.

Responsiveness to community needs. The University must remain a multi-campus system that meets the needs of California’s diverse population. Transparency, affordability, and proximity and accessibility of campus locations are vital.
Over the course of the four-day charrette, many participating faculty members expressed the need for immediate action and acknowledged that local campuses are ready for transformation. Participants confirmed the critical need to move forward with re-evaluation of and definitive change to the UC public university system, despite the nature and scale of the obstacles and challenges before them.

The focus of the final charrette work session was to determine (i) how to motivate and mobilize more faculty to take part in the design of their institutions, primarily through this process; and (ii) more broadly, how to advance this concept and process to the next stage.

Participating faculty identified the following strategies to mobilize faculty members and advance this effort across campuses and beyond.
A. Aligning Faculty and Building a Movement

1. Design an advocacy mechanism to encourage planning efforts by faculty. Make the need and incentives for action/participation in this endeavor clear, beginning with faculty and extending to other audiences.

2. Report back to campus Senates and faculty associations, campus administrations and students on this charrette and its outcomes. Get them on board with continuing the process.

3. Do a charrette on your own campus based on one of the twelve design principles. Involve post-charrette participants and new faculty members in that process.

4. Create study groups either through campus humanities centers or other such entities that focus on UC, its history, future and importance.

5. Convince your campus of the need to create a safe space for intercampus discussion and problem-solving, further development of the twelve design principles, and experimentation and incubation of ideas.

6. Identify interesting models of planning and governance. Conduct an inventory of best planning and governance practices and identify success stories.

7. Establish the faculty as a truly collective body. Consider the Senate as a possible ally in promoting faculty planning and innovation initiatives.

8. If possible, integrate your planning work into your research and teaching so that it becomes an organic part of what you do as a faculty member and not another “chore” added to your already heavy load.

9. Identify and collaborate with other multi-campus groups and research centers with similar goals and interests to become advocates and participants.

10. Develop written products and share them with Senate and campus leaders. Use social media to reach students and members of the public.

11. Bring in more outside non-UC perspectives to allow for divergent and disruptive thinking.
12. Reach out to the cities, neighborhoods and towns across California to bring in the voices of our communities, using the media to convey multiple stories. Use various media outlets to reach the public.

13. Reach out to decision-makers and legislators to answer the question of the role of the public university. Convene the Chancellors’ forum and present the “classroom of the future.”

14. Link UC, CSU and community colleges as envisioned by the original Master Plan. Work through the UC Curriculum Integration Institutes (UCCI).

15. Never give up. There is always strength and support to be found in reaching out. Remember nothing will happen overnight; this is just the beginning.

**B. Immediate Next Steps**

The following actions are recommended immediate next steps to maintain momentum around this critical endeavor:

- Disseminate the charrette summary to other faculty and internal audiences.
- Conduct additional charrettes and form faculty and student discussion groups.
- Work with campus administrations to create an innovation center on all campuses where faculty and students can converge and engage around these planning and visioning issues.
Convened by:

Ann Bermingham, History of Art and Architecture and Acting Director of the Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, UCSB
Catherine M. Cole, Theater, Dance and Performance Studies, UC Berkeley

Assisted by UCSB Interdisciplinary Humanities Center staff:

Emily Zinn, Associate Director
Alejandro Casazi, Senior Artist
Cole Cohen, Program and Events Coordinator

Facilitation team:

Amanda Eicher, OPENrestaurant
Marc Fisher, Campus Architect, UCSB
Esmeralda Garcia, MIG Inc.
Daniel Iacofano, MIG Inc.
Valerie Imus, OPENrestaurant
Clark Kellogg, Collective Invention and UC Berkeley
Pat McLaughlin, MIG Inc.
Jerome Waag, OPENrestaurant
Participants:

Linda Adler-Kassner, Writing Program, UCSB
Robert Anderson, UC System-wide Senate Chair, Economics, UC Berkeley
Steven Brint, Sociology, UC Riverside
Leo Cabrera-Grant, Theater, UCSB
Sharon Daniel, Film and Digital Media, UC Santa Cruz
Stanton Glantz, Medicine, UC San Francisco
Cristina Gonzalez, Education, UC Davis
Marina Gorbis, Institute for the Future
Evan Heit, Psychology, UC Merced
Jennifer Holt, Film & Media, UCSB
Bob Jacobsen, Physics, UC Berkeley
Peter Krapp, Film Studies, UC Irvine
Alan Liu, English, UCSB
David Marshall, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science, UCSB
Michael Meranze, History, UCLA
Harry Nelson, Physics, UCSB

Chris Newfied, English, UCSB
Henry Powell, Medicine, UCSD
Robert Powell, UC System-wide Senate Vice Chair, Chemical Engineering, UC Davis
Mark Richards, Executive Dean, L&S, UC Berkeley
Ananya Roy, City and Regional Planning, UC Berkeley
Cristina Sandoval, Marine Science Institute Coal Oil Point Reserve, UCSB
Dan Simmons, Law, UC Davis
Holly Unruh, UCIRA
Anne Walsh, Art Practice, UC Berkeley
Bill Warner, English, UCSB
Charles Wolfe, Film & Media Studies, UCSB
Kim Yasuda, Art Studio, UCSB and UCIRA
Charrette Sponsors:

- UC California Studies Consortium Systemwide Workshop
- University of California Humanities Research Institute
- UCSB Chancellor Henry Yang
- UCSB Executive Vice-Chancellor Gene Lucas
- UCSB College of Letters and Science Executive Dean David Marshall
- UCSB Interdisciplinary Humanities Center
- University of California Institute for Research in the Arts
- UCSB Faculty Association
- UC Systemwide Academic Senate
- UCB Faculty Association
- UCB Townsend Humanities Center Working Group, “Making UC Futures”