

# **Strategies for the Future of the University of Virginia**

**-- February 2008 --**

## **The University Today**

The University of Virginia evolved conceptually and physically from two of Thomas Jefferson's proposals to create public education in Virginia: his 1814 proposal for a school that would have been styled the Albemarle Academy, and (more directly) his 1817 proposal for Virginia to build regional colleges located around the state so that no citizen would live more than a day's ride on horseback from a college, and near Charlottesville, "the Central College." The nascent, privately financed institution for which President Monroe laid the cornerstone on October 6, 1817, while Jefferson and Madison stood by him, was in fact the first physical product of these proposals. By 1819, when the General Assembly finally passed the enabling legislation after delaying for four years, Jefferson's intent had changed from regional college to national university. What is now one of America's most prominent universities opened its doors in March 1825 to some 123 young men or boys drawn to it from village schools, local academies, and home learning to begin what was then as it is now a bold experiment in the shaping of free citizens for our Republic.

Over time, the University has continued to grow and change, with especially dramatic progress in at least two stages, one beginning with Edwin Alderman's arrival as president in 1904, and the other beginning with Edgar Shannon's inauguration in 1959. As the University has gained recognition during the last 50 or so years as one of two or three American public universities that define excellence in their programs, academic and physical growth have been more the rule than the exception. The next step is for the University to take its place as one of the world's greatest, which is to say most productive and widely recognized or respected universities, perhaps to solidify its value as one of our nation's most valuable assets. To fulfill these aspirations and to further distinguish the University, we will focus our immediate efforts on three priorities: the student experience; science, engineering, and technology; and global education. Our plans for these priorities are explained in greater detail later in this report.

We are aware of both considerable strengths and critical weaknesses in the University. Many things work well or superbly here. Some need work. This plan is about the job to be done, not about past glories.

We prepare young women and men for personal success and prosperity and for effective participation in public life by teaching and testing mastery of received knowledge, by discovering and using or deploying new knowledge, and by cultivating and sharpening critical thinking. Undergraduate life here combines academic learning with practical training in ethics, honor, self-governance, and a dozen other qualities or values that are essential to personal and public success, and it provides opportunities for relatively young adults to take courses or conduct mentored research in distinguished graduate and professional schools. The tradition is more and more to blur distinctions between areas of inquiry, and to encourage inter-disciplinarity, which is to say learning outside historic boundaries. The University blends the intimacy and collegiality of a liberal arts college with the vast resources of a major research university.

Jefferson wanted his new university to educate free people to enjoy the fruits of national freedom or independence, a purpose that evolved early toward educating leaders to work for the benefit of their fellow citizens—for the common good. “Enlighten the people generally,” he wrote, “and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.”

Students and faculty members here have always tried to imitate the founder’s defining qualities: the global spirit of his inquiring mind; his insistence on making ideas useful; his commitment to ethics; his belief that all change made by human effort is ultimately good when freedom exists; his dedication to the public good. The University’s identity as a public institution matters deeply to faculty members, staff, alumni, and students, as it does also to Virginians generally and to our elected officials.

What needs work? To consider the obvious: For more than 15 years, all of Virginia’s public colleges and universities have operated under reduced state appropriations. The most significant reductions came in two phases: one in 1990-1991 as the state dealt with reduced tax revenues during a recession; the other in 2002-2003 when a newly elected governor and General Assembly had to address a budgetary shortfall of almost \$6 billion resulting from weaker than expected economic growth in Virginia. State

support, formerly about 26 percent of the University's total budget, now amounts to slightly more than 8 percent.

For the last decade, private and public peer universities have made significant transformative investments in science research and technology, international programs, curricula, diversity, new faculty members, and new buildings to accommodate new emphases, especially in science. Relative to our peers, we are behind in certain areas, most notably science and engineering and the fine and performing arts. The physical and financial deficiencies in the sciences are especially critical. We need to address the absence of what one might call critical mass of faculty working in new and developing scientific and engineering fields, space for research and for teaching, and infrastructure. We spend too little to support graduate students, who are essential both to the renewal of national human capacity in science and engineering and to the ongoing processes of research here. Universities offering more competitive stipends often entice our most promising prospective graduate students to enroll elsewhere. The reasons for our lagging in science and technology are numerous. Among them, the absence of the continuing state commitments that have made these disciplines strong elsewhere—in Maryland, North Carolina, Georgia, Michigan, and California, for example—has handicapped all of Virginia's public universities since 1990 or so, and we have undoubtedly taken longer than we should have to recognize just how severe these deficiencies are.

That said, we believe that strategic vision and bold leadership can enable us to overcome these deficiencies and transform the University for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We must cultivate a forward-looking culture, characterized by agility and action—not unlike the one that Jefferson finally taught Virginia toward the end of his life. We must invest in the foundations of excellence: faculty members, including both replacements for uncommonly large numbers of retirees who will leave us during the next decade and faculty members in new positions as we repair the damage done by state reductions and staff up for work in new areas of engineering and science; foundational academic resources, including libraries and constantly renewed and updated digital facilities for teaching, research, and publications; faculty development, including new funding to support collaborative work with colleagues in foreign universities; mentoring programs for students at all levels; staff and office support; academic activity funds to enhance

ability to bring relevance to courses; financial aid for graduate and undergraduate students; and classroom and laboratory space.

We learned in the school of hard knocks during the early 1990s that the University cannot be all things to all people. We must make choices. No university has the means or the effectiveness in planning to launch every conceivable new initiative in every inviting field at one time. So our strategy is to strengthen our core resources while strategically funding selected new efforts that will further distinguish the University. The challenge is to choose wisely among competing excellent ideas. The goal has to be to identify and build the highest and best good or priority among many competing goods.

### **Why Plan Now?**

In the latter half of the twentieth century, American colleges and universities grew in size, scope, and quality, providing enormous benefits to industries, governments, and citizens of this nation and many others. In the aggregate, our private and public universities advanced from being seen as pretty good in the eyes of the world to being among the very best in the world. The combination of the GI Bill, the National Defense Education Act, and federal research appropriations to the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Department of Energy, and other agencies that were subsequently allocated by these agencies to researchers at universities on the basis of merit reviews made America's universities great during this critical half-century.

Our universities have competed effectively in this period. Competition today is more intense than it was 10 or 15 years ago because the number of players has grown. Singapore, India, China (with the national government, the army, and even city governments competing to support the very best universities), Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and (owing to the formation of the European Union's Higher Education Area) Europe have increased investments in higher education dramatically. The rewards of winning include human talent for future national prosperity, resources for institutional growth, and usable products. China's move to build hundreds of new senior universities and its determination to dominate the world universities' rankings in research are only the best known of these new initiatives. More so than at any time in history, colleges and

universities in the United States are in a “talent race” for the best students, faculty, and resources with other colleges and universities around the world, not just their domestic peers. Any American university not planning and gaining resources now to compete and collaborate with the best institutions globally has all but determined that it will make its way shortly into the second tier.

In this context, the forces shaping universities evolve rapidly. Access, affordability, accountability, and academic quality have become urgent issues here and abroad. National and global labor markets have reorganized to reward knowledge, innovation, and creativity for their corporate and national value. Oversimplifying only slightly, Singapore admits students from throughout South Asia and supports them, and allows the top 10 percent to remain to live and work there after graduation. National policy there explicitly seeks to build the region while retaining the very best in Singapore. Historically underrepresented in universities worldwide, minority students in their specific region have come to be recognized as valuable assets in this change. They bring distinctive backgrounds and talents; they leave after graduation to build prosperity and strength in whatever communities they join.

In the US, rapidly shifting demographics have changed what is expected of colleges and universities. In addition to educating their traditional constituencies, they are responsible nowadays also to seek out and enroll new populations, including those with lower income, to serve local and regional economic development efforts, and often as in Virginia to take on functions and costs that formerly belonged to state agencies, to deliver services (instruction, research, even clinical consultations) to underserved locations, and all the while to generate local prosperity for their home regions.

Governments worldwide strive to retain their most talented students and to attract talent from other nations. So do universities, but with a new twist—the rise of rankings as a force during the last two decades. In this country, most people think of *US News and World Report* or *Business Week* when they hear about rankings—rankings by which many students seem to plot their applications strategies, but in truth these more popular rankings are only one part of a larger story. Rankings influence parents, students, faculty and donors; rankings even subtly influence those considering the National Research Council’s decennial rankings and the Chinese World University rankings, prepared by

statisticians in China but financed by British institutions eager to displace *US News* and similar popular rankings as benchmarks of excellence. These represent a different and to some more serious side of rankings—the side that rewards the most serious investments in faculty members and facilities, especially for engineering and science. Even these are subject to variations owing to annual or decennial manipulations of the criteria on which rankings are calculated. Rankings of this kind are critical gauges of place within the global system of higher education.

In these relatively new contexts, the University competes today and will compete for the foreseeable future against elite universities with national and global identities. By and large, our international competitors receive more generous governmental support than we receive. Our US competitors vary, but the strongest of them (the national private universities, as well as Michigan and UC Berkeley) have invested in engineering and science and in the fine and performing arts without the constraints of Virginia's deteriorating system of public finance and with what is no doubt a clearer vision of the importance of investing in these fields than we have had, regardless of our means. Many have larger faculties, although not necessarily larger enrollments, bigger physical plants, especially for engineering, science, and the fine and performing arts, larger endowments, some of them many times ours, and enviable financial freedoms from regulation—freedoms only recently made available to U.Va.

This is not a complete listing of the challenges. The number of predictable faculty retirements in the coming decade is large because retirement ages reflect ages of entry into University employment. Our enrollments grew dramatically during the 1970s and throughout the 1980s owing to coeducation, the growth of the graduate schools, and state demands. Faculty members hired then are now generally in the age bracket 55-65. Retirements have begun, and the numbers will grow, even as we deal with the necessity of restoring student:faculty ratios of the kind we had before the state cuts began, and of the kind our competitors have still, and add new positions beyond these restorations to accommodate new work in engineering, science, the fine and performing arts, and no doubt other fields.

Then there are general challenges to our corporate capacities and willpower: an uncertain economy; the necessity that we succeed in managing and growing the private

resources amassed in this generation; sustaining unified, coherent work across the disciplines— in an era when inter-disciplinarity defines the most important new work, which by its synthetic nature threatens traditional views of the university as a community of independent silos, each isolated from all or most others. The Board’s ongoing efforts to coordinate some of the work of the independent, sometimes fractious school-based foundations is an asset: without it, the foundations with the best intentions may be tempted to see the Board or the University as the opponent and their schools as victims. None of these challenges is insurmountable. All will require consistent, clear-headed attention and sustained Board leadership if we are to progress as a university rather than regressing as a collection of underfunded, often bickering entities related largely in name rather than in common work.

### **The University Tomorrow**

In March 2007, President Casteen convened the Commission on the Future of the University, and asked its members to carry forward and complete the prior work of the Board’s Special Committee on Planning by proposing strategies to distinguish U.Va. from its peers in the next decade and beyond. Committee members include vice presidents, deans, faculty members, staff, students, and others with valuable expertise. Their deliberations have synthesized and built on previous planning efforts, including the Virginia 2020 retreats, Envision discussions, the Diversity and Equity Commission report, a Faculty Senate study of graduate students and programs, a comprehensive 10-year academic needs assessment, and consultants’ environmental scans and studies. The commission has met as a body of the whole and as separate committees for some nine months to frame recommendations for new directions. Its members have consulted the Faculty Senate, individual faculty members, students, alumni, Board members and committees, higher education consultants, and others. They have drawn upon their collective knowledge and expertise to evaluate strategic directions and recommend those judged to be the most advantageous. The commission’s reports inform and complement the strategies described in the following pages.

We face now several years during which one generation's leaders will retire and new leaders will have to be developed, recruited, selected, and vested with appropriate responsibilities and points of accountability. As noted earlier in this report, many senior faculty are approaching retirement. Much of our reputation for academic excellence was built during this generation on the work of these scholars and teachers. Half of our deanships and two vice-presidencies are open or will be soon. President Casteen and Executive Vice President Sandridge plan to retire within five years, taking with them decades of experience and expertise. The rising generation of new University leaders and a Board whose membership is constantly renewed will need a guiding instrument, a compass, to direct their work in the years ahead to ensure the University's continued effectiveness and to position the institution for preeminence. This report and its recommendations for strategic directions are intended to provide sound bases for the decisions these new leaders must make to sustain and improve the University.

The recently restructured relationship with the Commonwealth of Virginia, high returns on investments including those from the last capital campaign, a new \$3 billion campaign now under way, and an endowment that ranks among the 20 largest in the nation are core assets for the future. Barring a major change in national and state policy on investing in university work and people—a change no one seriously expects to come soon—private sources must continue to carry ever larger proportions of our operating budgets. Old assumptions about public support do not work in an environment of deterioration of both federal and state funding and new unfunded requirements or demands. We have learned new ways to operate. We must develop new kinds of knowledge and new disciplines and skills in order to continue. The accompaniment to the autonomy with which our schools raise and deploy their private moneys is the inevitable but difficult obligation to address their own needs rather than counting on the Board to carry them. Central funding will remain important, for infrastructure and most importantly for strategic investment, in people, facilities and infrastructure; the greater the amount of unrestricted central funds, the more nimble we can be to address emerging areas.

In ten years, the University will be a substantially different institution than it is today. Our broad vision is to sustain core traditions and historic strengths, address areas needing

improvement, and make the University a more globally oriented institution. Broadly stated, the University will strategically increase its size and diversity, increase the percentage of scientists and engineers among the faculty, attract and retain the best graduate students, build much needed academic research and teaching facilities, increase the quantity and quality of international partnerships, and claim the University's primacy in service to the public good.

The commission proposes a set of core institutional values and three overarching priorities for the next decade: Student Experience; Science and Technology; and Global Education. Framing these priorities in detail and ascertaining that the schools pay appropriate attention to other priorities, such as developments in the fine and performing arts, makes the articulation of values not only consistent with aspirations and history but also calculated to accelerate the institutional evolution described at the beginning of this report. We believe that declared values must determine the University's priorities. We begin, therefore, with a declaration of our values.

### **Our Core Values**

These core values guide the discussions, actions, and funding of the University of Virginia's community of teachers and learners:

- Honor and ethics
- Faculty excellence
- Innovation and collaboration in the pursuit of knowledge
- Diversity
- Leadership for the Public Good and Education for Freedom

Living by these values prepares students to graduate from the University as enlightened leaders ready for effective engagement in public life in their communities, their professions, and the world. They leave the University, but the University never leaves them.

**Honor and ethics.** University students take responsibility for themselves and for one another. The community trusts them in their academic behavior. In exchange for this right, they take responsibility to act against lying, cheating, and stealing. This concept of

honor and responsibility informs student self-governance in each of its senses: conduct, social organizations, and virtually all other aspects of student life here. The University integrates practical ethics into many disciplines. We believe in expanding and enhancing the teaching of ethics in all of our schools, with primary emphasis on personal responsibility.

**Faculty excellence.** Seeking professors for a newly conceived university perched literally on the margin of the unknown, Jefferson wrote that he was “anxious to receive none but of the highest grade” for his founding faculty. Today, as then, the quality of our teachers, researchers, clinicians, and scholars defines the University’s worth.

We will recruit and retain new faculty members of the highest order, replace retiring faculty members, and develop new expertise in research, scholarship, and teaching. We will reduce the student:faculty ratio at least to what it was prior to the state reductions of 1990-1991, and aim to take it lower to expand the faculty’s range of expertise and capacities and to assure students the personal attention that characterizes teaching and independent study in the best American universities. We will foster greater student to faculty collaboration as a first benefit of restoring an appropriate student:faculty ratio and also asserting our emphasis on personal competence.

We will form an institute for teaching research and improvement. Participants in this pan-University initiative will perform research on teaching methods in every school to identify better ways to lecture and to teach in large- and small-group settings. The Institute will identify opportunities for improvement in specific schools—for example, by teaching business or commerce professors to write better cases, by teaching doctors better methods for examining patients, and by teaching K-12 teachers to improve their teaching methods with science students.

As we seek new members of the faculty and University leaders generally, our charges to search committees and hiring criteria will emphasize creativity, originality, and entrepreneurial skills. After hiring the best, we will help them grow professionally by mentoring both new and established faculty; conducting needs assessments to identify best practices; providing ongoing educational programs and academic leave opportunities for faculty members; and constantly improving teaching methods, including the integration and use of new technologies in our classrooms and laboratories, in all

disciplines. We will monitor our progress and results in faculty development. We will continue to recruit diverse faculty to tenured and tenure-track positions, especially in science, technology, engineering, and medicine. We will review existing promotion, tenure, and advancement processes for faculty members who have joint appointments and who are engaged in collaborative research.

**Innovation and collaboration.** Jefferson's first professors lived and taught their courses in pavilions on the Lawn where their students also lived, an arrangement intended to make collaboration among all the members of the University a daily custom. Now, important discoveries occur at the nexus of disciplines: design and technology, mathematics and art, music and neuroscience, law or a dozen other fields and the environment, architecture and public health. To support the commitment to innovation and collaboration, the provost and deans will convene over the next year to develop methodologies to promote collaboration. We will fund multi-disciplinary research and scholarship that spans schools and departments. The provost will identify obstacles to effective collaboration, examine best practices in peer universities, recommend solutions, and modify existing structures. Collaboration across schools will improve as we adopt strategic approaches to joint learning, joint research, and joint service in science, international programs, the humanities, and environmental sustainability. We will see a marked increase in cross-school collaborative programs in research, teaching, and service. Boundaries between classrooms, libraries, labs, and studios will dissolve as faculty members, graduate students, and undergraduates work together in multidisciplinary teams to generate discoveries. We will design a technology-transfer process that will become widely recognized as a model service to faculty and a resource for industry. We will collect key information about the research and scholarship of every faculty member and student in a database to allow members of the community to identify potential collaborators within disciplines and across disciplines.

**Diversity.** Diversity in universities enriches teaching, learning, and research. Mixing people from different backgrounds together allows them to question assumptions, especially their own. In the environment of our Republic, diversity has led to discovery, enlightenment, and tolerance. We value racial, ethnic, national, economic, and intellectual diversity as fundamental elements of academic life. The deans of our schools

will develop diversity goals tailored to their units, and learn best practices from each other and from other institutions. They will publish their results, and seek constant means to improve. The University will practice diversity through its procurement activity, consistent with state law, especially with regard to small, women-owned, and minority businesses. Throughout the University, we will embrace diversity as a core value with the same rigor that we embrace honor, ethics, and integrity.

**Leadership for the Public Good and Education for Freedom.** As we noted in beginning, the University had its origin in the conceptions that knowledge engenders personal freedom and thus protects national freedom or independence. Jefferson believed that knowledge could save his Republic, that it was the precondition to ameliorating the human condition. This intention implies a core concern with the education and training of leaders equal to the Republic's needs.

Many schools and departments emphasize leadership development. Capitalizing on this asset, we will take a multidisciplinary approach to public service, one that draws on the talents and knowledge of all members of our community, and encourages public service in all academic units. The Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy will provide a new emphasis on the teaching of leadership related to public policy. The University will launch a new program to enable each student and a faculty mentor to design, plan, and lead a team in an innovative public-service project in Charlottesville or elsewhere in the world. *Public*, a new U.Va. journal, will publish the results and stimulate scholarly discourse about the nature of leadership in society. A University-wide pilot program will identify needs in selected communities or regions in the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world, to help solve those problems with service and community projects.

Each of these core values informs and enriches all the others. Faculty excellence requires faculty diversity. Innovation and collaboration provide models for discovery and leadership, and enrich the academic enterprise for both faculty members and students who will become future leaders. Honor and ethics inform public service. These equal core values govern everything we do, and will always shape our priorities.

## Our Three Priorities

To reconfigure the University to meet the local, national, and global needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and to become one of the world's great public institutions, the commission recommends three priorities:

- The Student Experience
- Science and Technology
- Global Education.

These three efforts will build and sustain core strength, enable innovation, and ensure our readiness to change and effect change.

**1. The Student Experience: Building on Strength.** Persons connected with the University agree that our graduates are different: bright, socially adept, confident, committed, and ethical. Employers often report that new graduates need less training than those from other institutions: they come to work knowing how to communicate, to think innovatively, and with the self-confidence to use their minds. These qualities derive in large part from how undergraduate students live and what they learn from their professors and from one another—from the undergraduate experience. Building on that powerful base, we will make service learning, learning by serving others, community-based research, and field experiences, including study abroad, integral parts of the student culture of self-governance, service, and leadership. Students, working independently and in teams, will have the opportunity to engage in self-directed research and service. We will align curricula with society's most pressing concerns to the end of building academic rigor into public service, building global literacy, and encouraging collaboration with partners near and far, including graduate and professional faculty and students. We will consider recognizing graduates who complete these courses of study and experiences with special honors at Final Exercises.

All students need appropriate advising and mentoring to guide them through their years of study here. We will increase students' access to faculty and student advisors and mentors. We will create innovative opportunities for intellectual engagement beyond the classroom, for example by engaging students in environmental stewardship while

bringing science and other disciplines, not least among them health policy, law, economics, architecture, and engineering to bear on global problems.

Access to courses and faculty members is critical. We will install an effective registration system to enable students to sign up for the courses they need and want. To assist new first-year and transfer students with their transition, we will increase informal collaboration and communication among existing advisor programs, and ensure that every new student who wants a mentor gets one. We will initiate a summer program for new transfer students to enhance their prospects of success even in the first semester after enrolling, and will increase the number of College Advising Seminars and first-year seminars available to new students. The Rainey program, which assists low-income, high-achievement students as they move from high school to the University, will expand.

The University's academic success depends on first-rate graduate students. They contribute to scholarly inquiry, assure a challenging level of intellectual discourse in classrooms and with faculty, collaborate on research teams, and strengthen the teaching enterprise. They will become the college and university faculties of the future. If we do our jobs well, they will emerge as leaders in all scholarly disciplines. The University will determine by careful analysis of national and international best practices what resources are appropriate to the recruitment and retention of top graduate students, amass those resources, and commit them. Our current funding packages for some graduate students do not compete with peer institutions; top students often elect to enroll elsewhere. The need for adequate graduate-student funding continues beyond the first year of study, as students balance teaching and teaching-assistant assignments with coursework and research. Therefore, in cases where research indicates that increased stipends will provide a competitive advantage in areas of highest institutional priority, we will increase the minimum stipends for graduate students, and realign the criteria that define a full teaching load. We will develop a family-friendly benefits package for graduate students and their dependents.

A transformative student experience requires excellent faculty. To sustain excellence in the humanities and social sciences, and to build and enhance quality across the institution, the University will hire approximately 200 additional professors, inclusive of scientists, most of them in the College, the School of Engineering and Applied Science,

and the School of Medicine. We project 320 faculty retirements, including many of our most prestigious and productive professors, during the next ten years. Consequently, we will hire 500-600 new faculty by the 2017-2018 academic year. This expansion will result in a student:faculty ratio equal to or less than 16:1 in the schools that enroll undergraduates. We will look for dedicated leaders and faculty with new ideas, scholars who like to cross disciplinary lines, and match them with administrators who cultivate vision and innovation.

Creating new programs requires both maintaining our existing physical plant and erecting new buildings to match rising student enrollment and expanding research requirements. Virtually every academic unit reports concerns about the quantity and quality of space. We must constantly assess the quantity, quality, size, and condition of the buildings that support academic endeavors. When physical expansion is justified, we will develop proper plans, amass the necessary resources, and build.

The University is committed to protecting and improving the environment through teaching and research and through investments in well-designed buildings, optimized land use, provision of public transportation, energy efficiency, water preservation, waste reduction, and recycling. The Board has mandated that all new construction and major renovation projects comply with the standards of the US Green Building Council through Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. The Grounds Improvement Fund (GIF) will finance much-needed improvements, including landscape and pedestrian / bicycle accommodations. Historic structures and landscapes on the Grounds require careful attention and appropriate levels of funding to preserve their traditional character while maintaining their usefulness as academic buildings.

We will build new facilities for the fine and performing arts. The South Lawn ensemble of buildings will house programs in the humanities and social sciences. Phase 1 will add approximately 110,000 gross square feet of space, and will provide new homes for the departments of history, politics, and religious studies when it is completed in about two years. Phase 2 will rebuild New Cabell Hall, which houses many major lecture halls and academic departments. New construction for architecture and studio art is now under way, and the reconstruction of Fayerweather Hall for art history was completed a year ago. We will complete planning and fund raising for the Arts Gateway project to

provide proper facilities for the Art Museum; spaces for performance, rehearsal, and studio work; the first concert hall to be built here; and assuming that analysis justifies it, a residential college for faculty members and students in the fine and performing arts.

**2. Science and Technology: Research and Teaching.** A major research university must have capacity and competence in science, engineering, and technology. We have not kept pace in these fields with peer universities. Rather than attempt across-the-board excellence, we will solidify existing areas of strength in basic sciences and engineering, and expand selectively in promising new areas.

To accomplish this goal, we must increase the size of our faculties in mathematics, science, and engineering throughout the University. To prepare for new faculty members, we will construct new laboratory space immediately. Planning is in progress now. We will maintain strength in digital scholarship, radio astronomy, environmental science and sustainability, morphogenesis, information engineering, and biomedical engineering. We will plan for significant growth in translational research and public health, possibly founding a School of Public Health. To encourage and support collaboration, we will create grants for research and teaching across schools, and improve the infrastructure to support multi-investigator proposals. We are planning a new doctoral program in translational research with a core three-year seminar in innovation.

Remaining competitive among top-tier universities will require major investment in information infrastructure—computing capacity of all kinds. To attract and retain the best talent and increase research funding, faculty members, and students must have computing systems, services, and support on a par with the world's top private and public universities. Especially in engineering and the sciences, modern research requires significant new resources in academic computing. We will build information technology infrastructure to connect faculty, students, and staff across the Grounds and around the globe in a cost-effective manner.

The University will develop, vet, and publish a science strategy to build strength within disciplines and across them. To ensure core science and engineering strength, deans will determine their school's strategies, consulting with the vice president for research and the provost. These two officers will conduct pan-University science

planning, emphasizing new collaborative programs across schools, with regular input from deans, department heads, and appropriate faculty members. These plans will be identified separately but published as part of the overall planning updates for the University.

**3. Global Education, Research, and Service at Home and Abroad.** The word “global” captures one aspect of the University’s need and desire for openness to the whole world. We look outside ourselves for the best practices and people; maintain a worldwide presence; seek global needs that we can meet or help meet, including needs involving the environment; and promote respect for differences among nations and cultures. In this new global century, regional and national aspirations are insufficient. The inter-connectedness of nations and economies demands that we prepare students for work, life, and leadership on a global scale. To equip students for success in the global economy and to prepare them for public life, the University will become a center for discovery, study, and service on a global scale. We will broaden curricula and extracurricular programs to feature global themes, and will create new global courses, majors, and minors. We will label courses that offer global perspectives, enabling students to devise coherent plans of global study. We will consider recognizing graduates who complete international courses of study and study-abroad experiences with special honors at Final Exercises. We will promote language study to the point of advanced proficiency as an essential skill. We will also invite prominent faculty members and students from other nations to the Grounds in greater numbers to bring global influences to bear on intellectual life here. Students and professors will engage in teaching, research, and service programs in global settings, and initiate global partnerships. They will conduct teaching, research, and service programs in underserved areas, and pursue entrepreneurial activities around the world.

### **Paying for the Future**

The University relies on private and public financial support. Yet the Commonwealth of Virginia provides relatively modest General Fund support by comparison to other

states, and that support has continued to deteriorate for almost two decades after having been originally cut as a temporary contingency during a recession. Most public universities are better supported by their states. That fact acknowledged, state support will remain essential to the University's success, and will meet many needs so long as those responsible for the University act with the understanding that these resources alone will not sustain excellence. To move in the strategic directions proposed here, we must continue to seek as much support as the Commonwealth can provide. We must engage alumni and friends to an even greater extent. We must capitalize on our recent restructuring agreement with the state, and on the 2007 investment legislation to maximize the University's autonomy, accountability, flexibility, and planning. We must increase our financial agility and remove bureaucratic barriers. We must more aggressively use available debt capacity to build essential facilities on a timely schedule.

Fundraising evolves, and in fundamental ways, we are still learning. Our recent successes grew from a catastrophe—the state funding reductions of 1990-1991. For the near future, we will have to redesign our fundraising structures to make them even more effective. Our current structure of both central development and school foundations is unusual, and it causes inefficiencies, despite uncommon fundraising success. We will create a long-range plan to match the cost of development with the dollars raised as a means to sustain all necessary development enterprises while serving both University and school interests. This solution will require advances in practice and philosophy, but it has the potential to yield significant benefits.

We will seek larger numbers of unrestricted gifts with higher values. The importance of unrestricted gifts was clearly illustrated in 2004, when the Rector and Visitors increased access to the University for low-income, high-achievement students by replacing burdensome loans with full-cost grants. The resulting program, AccessUVa, has become a model of higher education access among flagship universities. We could not have responded to this pressing institutional need in such a timely manner without central unrestricted funds.

AccessUVa also illustrates why we need to seek restricted resources to provide permanent funding for programs that initially receive unrestricted support. We currently invest over \$20 million annually in unrestricted funds to support AccessUVa and the

need for funds continues to increase as tuition and the numbers of low-income students increase. Dollars raised to support this program directly will free up those unrestricted funds for other pressing needs.

### **Planning the Future**

Universities meet the needs of a changing society by perpetually re-imagining and re-inventing themselves. Jefferson wrote that “Science is progressive. What was useful two centuries ago is now become useless ... what is now deemed useful will in some of its parts become useless in another century.” To meet the needs of this century and the next, the University will become a national model for excellence in institutional planning.

We will establish a permanent office to plan the University’s future, to help implement those plans, and to assess performance. Personnel assigned to this office will attempt to address some of the most vexing questions confronted by university planners and leaders. For example, students, parents, legislators, faculty, and administrators pay attention to popular national rankings of institutions of higher education. Rankings will not guide the University, but we cannot ignore them altogether. We will review the positions of our schools, departments, and programs periodically, and will use movement up or down the rankings as only one indicator of progress toward goals. We will apply specific metrics to mark our position among peers, analyze the products of strategic investments, and measure progress made toward our aspirations.

Strategic planning will inform everything the University does. The provost will oversee planning with wide representation from students, faculty, staff, alumni, and others, in close coordination with the president, the executive vice president/chief operating officer, and the senior vice president for development and public affairs. University leaders will monitor and report progress toward quantitative goals established in past planning efforts. They will ensure compliance with the Restructured Higher Education Financial and Administrative Operations Act. And they will monitor progress toward performance measures as prescribed by the Board of Visitors and its committees.

The University lacks a coherent, centralized, and transparent process for generating and vetting “big ideas” for new academic programs, especially when these big ideas cut

across the lines between departments or schools, and for advancing them from conception through implementation. We will create a permanent mechanism, perhaps a standing committee or advisory board, to oversee this process. This mechanism will enhance our capacity to fulfill the promises and aspirations of the current campaign. The funding of new initiatives will depend on their ability to meet criteria determined by this committee or board, criteria closely aligned with the institution's priorities and core values. The evaluation criteria will serve as both a template for proposals and as a means of evaluating, ranking, and providing feedback to proposers during each step of the proposal process.

### **Let Us Begin**

This report began with President Monroe's laying on October 6, 1817, of Pavilion VII's cornerstone and the beginning of the modest regional college that became the University of Virginia. Our work begins there also in a substantive sense because our aspirations and our Republic's requirements derive directly from those that led Monroe, Madison, and Jefferson to create this institution. Jefferson and his collaborators believed, as we do, that educated people, led by informed and enlightened leaders, would provide the surest means of preserving the new nation's hard-won freedoms. This academic community rising in "an old turned-out field" west of Charlottesville articulated the founders' vision that self-evident truths define freedom. Knowledge creates freedom, and freedom enables knowledge.

We will not lose sight of these founding ideals as we redefine the purposes of a public university for a new century. At Thomas Jefferson's University, we use the term *public* to mean excellence—in teaching, research, and service for the public good. We will draw on the strength of this University's rich past while building a future worthy of it, one cognizant of the full realm of need and possibility. By strengthening core resources while launching new initiatives in areas of strategic importance, this University will fulfill for yet another generation its obligations to further the common prosperity, to serve the needs of communities at home and abroad, and to advance the frontiers of knowledge. This University must serve its purpose with uncommon excellence and an unmistakable

benefit to the public. American democracy, the Republic, and the public good require it.  
By these declarations, we claim this University's primacy in service to that public good.

## **Appendix A: Measuring Progress**

Strategic planning cannot succeed without realistic means of measuring results. Lacking specific targets and dates, progress slides as people remain enmeshed in their daily lives and professional concerns. We must know where we are now, where we are at any given time, and where we intend to be in the near and far future. Along the way, we need ways to gauge progress toward goals so we can modify our efforts and react quickly to changing situations. Pending approval of these strategic directions by the University's Board of Visitors, University leaders will propose measures of progress.

Persons responsible for each priority will propose instruments and targets for their respective initiatives beginning with the 2008-09 academic year (fiscal year '09). They will re-analyze goals each year—developing and retiring goals as appropriate—and will engage advisory groups to inform their implementation plans.

Vice presidents, vice provosts, deans, and other University leaders will align resources with the priorities named in “Strategies for the Future of the University of Virginia.” They will also assume core responsibility for other priorities contained within their units. These initiatives are aspirational. We will seek resources to finance them. As we attract these resources, we will deploy them quickly.

Leaders will produce a summary of progress made toward past goals (December), will develop goals for the upcoming fiscal year (February), and, if necessary, will submit budget addenda requests (March). After review by the president, executive vice presidents, and the Board of Visitors, University leaders will adopt these goals and place resources in service to those goals. In all cases, leaders will study peer comparators and best practices to inform their plans. The University aspires to build models for the US and world in areas of highest priority.

The table below identifies the administrators who will lead implementation of the “Strategies for the Future of the University of Virginia.” Each leader will work with colleagues who will include, as appropriate, students, staff and faculty.

## Accountability

<b>Area / Metrics</b>	<b>Leaders</b>	<b>Colleagues (partial list)</b>
University planning	Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Executive Vice President and Provost, Senior Vice President for Development and Public Affairs	Vice Presidents Vice Provosts
Priority: Student Experience	Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	Vice President and Chief Student Affairs Officer
Priority: Science and Technology	Vice President for Research	Deans
Priority: Global Education	Vice Provost for International Affairs	Deans
Schools and cross-school collaboration	Executive Vice President and Provost	Deans
Medical Center	Chief Executive Officer, Medical Center	Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
New programmatic initiatives	Assistant Provost for Planning and Development	Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Executive Vice President and Provost, Senior Vice President for Development and Public Affairs, Associate Vice President and President's Chief of Staff
<i>Funding Strategies for the Future of the University</i>	Vice Provost for Administration and Chief of Staff	Vice President for Management and Budget Senior Vice President for Development and Public Affairs
University Fiscal and Physical Resources	Vice President for Management and Budget	Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Chief Facilities Officer University Architect Assistant Vice President for Budget and Financial Planning
Faculty	Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement	Faculty Members
Academic infrastructure	Vice President and Chief Information Officer	University Librarian Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer