All members of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia, save R.J. Kirk, met, in Retreat and in Open and Executive Session, at the Omni Hotel in Richmond, Virginia on Wednesday and Thursday, August 15-16, 2012; Helen E. Dragas, Rector, presided.


Also present were Ms. Teresa A. Sullivan, John D. Simon, Ms. Susan G. Harris, and Assistant Attorney General Ronald C. Forehand.

Also present for a portion of Wednesday’s session was Sam Parker and Association of Governing Boards facilitator, Terrence MacTaggart. For Thursday’s session, Mr. MacTaggart and Gregory W. Roberts, Dean of Admission, were present.

Wednesday, August 15

Lunch began at 12:15 p.m., concluding with a presentation by Sam Parker about making good things happen for other people.

The afternoon session began at 1:40 p.m. with opening remarks from the Rector. Her remarks are reproduced verbatim as an attachment to the Minutes.

Following the Rector’s remarks, President Teresa Sullivan welcomed everyone to the retreat. She said this is an important time for all to be able to step back and reflect on the conditions that face all of higher education, but also the University particularly, and to come together to work towards a common objective as we lay out plans for the coming year.

President Sullivan said it is important to work collaboratively, and for the Board members to think about how they can organize themselves effectively. She said the administration will do everything they can to facilitate the
operation of the Board’s committees and make this year a successful one.

The Rector introduced Dr. Terry MacTaggart, Association of Governing Boards facilitator, to lead the discussion. Dr. MacTaggart is the former chancellor of the University of Minnesota and the University of Maine system. He is an expert on higher education governance, particularly as it relates to leading change and seeking excellence and accountability.

Dr. MacTaggart began by acknowledging that the retreat environment was an awkward one with the press, microphones, and cameras in the room. He asked the group assembled to relax and be as candid and conversational as possible.

Dr. MacTaggart addressed leading change and excellence, emphasizing that the best boards work with their presidents to build and maintain exceptional institutions. He mentioned a handout written by Jeffrey Sonnenfeld on what makes great boards great. Sonnenfeld said it is not the do’s and don’ts, but rather it’s how members interact with each other in making the right decisions and asserting leadership. Dr. MacTaggart said a great board does more than that: discussion will lead to figuring out how to work together, how to interact with the president, and how to define exceptionality and a superior institution.

Dr. MacTaggart explained that he had spoken with several members prior to the meeting and from those conversations he outlined important areas for discussion including:

1. A summary of important trends and pressures that are going on in the world that will shape thinking about strategic planning;
2. The Board’s role in bringing about positive change;
3. How to contribute and how not to contribute;
4. “Essential Relationships”; and
5. “Leadership and Conversation”.

He outlined five forces, pressures, or trends that are important in shaping and sustaining world-renowned institutions:

1. The shrinking of the American pie and the difficulties for the next generation;
2. “Shanghai rules”, or thinking at the next level, being on the cutting edge, and providing knowledge as a resource;
3. Disruptive innovation, or the idea that one must be attuned to what is going on in higher education that could lead to a better, more efficient, option for teaching and learning. He mentioned Clay Christensen’s work on innovation and the use of technology in higher education;

4. Quality is questioned: one must always be questioning how the institution can improve—it’s about results; and

5. Raising the bar for trustees by expecting more from them: using their expertise, talking with the president and faculty experts, thinking issues through on a deep level and coming up with the right plans and policies.

The Board engaged in extensive discussion on the five forces, sharing differing opinions on whether the pie was actually shrinking and how the University of Virginia was positioned with regard to these factors. Dr. MacTaggart said one important factor for public universities is government control—how can public institutions get enough independence from government regulation, controls on tuition, et cetera, to have the same kind of freedom to operate as the great independent schools?

Dr. MacTaggart presented the “high performance pyramid” on what separates good, better, and great boards. Good boards are champions of the brand and reputation. They have fiduciary responsibility and are the individuals who ultimately ensure a culture of integrity. Better boards do these things and more. They are characterized by sophisticated, mature, and energetic relationships both within themselves and in the political and fundraising world. The best boards assert positive change leadership with the president. They ‘upstream’ discussions before a problem or crisis hits to avoid serious consequences down the road. They are able to apply brain power and experience while also separating this from their governing authority. They back up change when needed and provide crucial thought leadership. Good boards know not to micromanage; lousy board members say, “It’s my idea, I am a board member and you will do it.”

After a break, there were some follow-up comments about the University’s position vis-à-vis peers, and that we are in a situation where we are close to the top, but we should still strive to be better. This requires constant change and innovation to do what our peers are not doing. President Sullivan said this requires being able to visualize the negative space—where we want to be in five years. She said that is one of the biggest challenges in hiring new faculty: we are not hiring for today but for the disciplines and individuals that will be
important ten years from now. There were a number of other comments along these lines.

Dr. MacTaggart turned the discussion to best practices in strategic planning, raising various recommendations from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). He said the conventional planning methods tended to create strategic fatigue and skepticism because there was no buy-in or follow-through. In one model, a "pie in the sky" plan is developed with little rigor to the plan, few metrics, and little or no external evaluation of the plan. He said the other extreme is the "smartest guys in the room" model, where a few on the Board develop a good plan but the process doesn't include anybody but a handful of people. This can work in a crisis situation, but not for long-term planning where constituents must be included in the process. Dr. MacTaggart said the seven critical success factors for strategic planning are practical vision; board presence and dialogue; faculty participation; larger community involvement; rigor in metrics; formal confirmation; and solidarity in the face of pushback.

In response to a question, Dr. MacTaggart said the typical timeline for strategic planning, in his experience, was a year to do a thorough job. Meaningful involvement from all areas of the University is essential. He said the life of a strategic plan is about 5 to 7 years; changes are so rapid that a ten-year plan, when you get to the 5 to 7 year mark, is no longer relevant. A plan should be revisited every year. President Sullivan told the Board that faculty retirements will be a big factor in the next ten years, and she and the Provost need to change the way new faculty are hired, no longer replacing the retiring faculty in their specific disciplines but looking at where the University needs to go with the curriculum in the future.

Mr. Rose presented a draft of a proposed process for strategic planning to the Board for their consideration. The draft:

1. Provides a brief needs statement;

2. Assigns the process to the President and her leadership team;

3. Focuses the planning process and outcomes on the whole University;

4. Identifies planning components: institutional assessment, environmental scan, strengths, opportunities, and threats;
5. Identifies planning outcomes: a manageable list of strategic initiatives and priorities with indicators of success, performance measures, and responsible parties;

6. Suggests a planning organization: steering committee, work groups with broad engagement of stakeholders, particularly the Faculty Senate;

7. Recommends the use of consultants;

8. Proposes an interactive process with scheduled opportunities for board member engagement;

9. Identifies topics to be considered by the plan; and

10. Provides an opportunity for immediate attention to pressing topics such as Access UVA and faculty recruitment and retention. Mr. Rose said the University cannot take a "strategic pause"; we must continue to advance pressing issues during the planning process.

Mr. Rose said they have asked President Sullivan for a timeline for the process. Mr. Atkinson mentioned the importance of including the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2011 in the strategic planning process. Mr. Rose said that by the September Board meeting they would have preliminary work completed so the charge to President Sullivan could be provided. He asked the members to provide comments to him before that date. Mr. Rose also clarified that the Health System should be part of the plan, but they would not revisit the strategic plan for the Health System that is in the early stages of implementation. There is a place for accommodating parts of that plan in the University-wide plan.

Executive Session:

After adopting the following motions, the Board went into closed session at 3:50 p.m.:

That the Board of Visitors convene in executive session to confer with legal counsel and consider his legal advice and briefing on pending litigation and legal matters involving the University, and to discuss personnel-related matters that will necessarily involve discussion of the performance of specific individuals. The relevant exemptions to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act authorizing the discussion and consultation described above are provided for in Section 2.2-3711 (A)(1) and (7) of the Code of Virginia.

At 6:15 p.m., the Board resumed in open session. On motion, the Board adopted the following resolution certifying that the deliberations in Closed Session had been conducted in
accordance with the exemptions permitted by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act:

That we vote on and record our certification that, to the best of each member’s knowledge (i) only matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements under the Freedom of Information Act were discussed, and (ii) only matters identified in the motion to have the closed session were discussed.

On motion, the meeting was recessed at 6:20 p.m. until the following day.

Thursday, August 16

The session began at 8:36 a.m. with Terry MacTaggart leading a discussion on Board organization and how to support positive change. Two important topics were addressed, the committee structure and the difference between the role of the Board and the role of the President.

Dr. MacTaggart asked the Board to provide suggestions to the Governance and Engagement Committee, prompting them to determine how the committees can be useful to the Board and University. Members of the Board said there seem to be near-term and long-term pieces to governance and engagement issues.

Committee structure and meeting times were discussed. Dr. MacTaggart asked the Board to consider if they thought the current sequential committee meetings were beneficial, or if a different approach such as concurrent meetings would be more effective. Bill Goodwin said that in the past, committee meetings were held separately from the regular Board meetings, and the committee chairs provided short reports at the regular meetings. Leonard Sandridge reviewed the evolution of committee work in the past, explaining that there were periods where committees scheduled separate meetings and periods where the committee meetings were part of regular Board meetings. He said both structures had their advantages; the preference of the Board members should guide the committee meeting schedule.

President Sullivan explained that each committee has a vice president or other high level administrator assigned to it as staff for the committee work.

Several members of the Board expressed their interest in holding concurrent meetings with fewer members. This approach requires Board members to trust that their fellow members will be actively involved in their assigned committees, and allows for deeper knowledge and involvement in the committees on which members serve.
Dr. MacTaggart asked the Board to reflect on the number of committees, and George Martin explained that as co-chair of the Governance and Engagement Committee he was working on a plan to reduce the number of committees. Mr. Martin said he saw some benefits in designating certain current standing committees as sub-committees of other committees; he acknowledged that if the Board decides to have concurrent meetings, the composition of the committees will need to change.

John Nau said defining committees and their roles based on the direction of the strategic planning committee is important.

President Sullivan and John Simon said they saw the benefits of longer concurrent meetings from an administrative viewpoint. Longer meetings will allow for discussion of issues in greater depth.

Dr. MacTaggart defined the difference between the role of the president and administration and the role of the Board. He explained that areas requiring high Board involvement and low administrative involvement are the election of the rector and selection of committees. Areas that require high involvement from both parties include strategic planning, big problems, fundraising, and political or governmental issues.

Board members discussed what defines a “big problem” and touched on the idea that any matter that could publicly embarrass or affect the institution is important to bring to the Board’s attention.

Board members broached the subject of the election process and timeline for the rector and vice rector. Some felt that electing a vice rector for two years who then assumed the rectorship was not an ideal system. One member suggested a three year term for the rector, and the vice rector would not automatically assume the rectorship. The Governance and Engagement Committee was asked to evaluate best practices for election and length of terms.

Dr. MacTaggart handed out a document on how boards contribute to positive change and made a few remarks about the material.

Comments from the Student Member

The Rector asked student member Hillary Hurd to share her thoughts on student issues going forward for the year. The Rector said a presentation from the student member will be a regular agenda item so that the Board can hear a student’s perspective.
Ms. Hurd said she cannot represent the student opinion, because with such a diverse student population, there is never one student opinion. The diversity of student opinion is what makes the University great. This diversity will be a positive factor for the Board and administration in evaluating the weaknesses and strengths of the University in the process of developing a strategic plan. Ms. Hurd sees her role on the Board to be one where she acts as a liaison in collecting various student opinions from different pockets of the university. In thinking about governance and strategy there are ways to focus different student groups on specific issues, therefore allowing for a different angle to be presented on topics such as optimizing research opportunities and evaluating hybrid classes and teaching methods. She encouraged the Board members to think about how to actively involve students and student groups, and how to incorporate their opinions in the strategic planning and governance work.

President’s Report

President Sullivan said the University of Virginia was recently ranked the number one state university by Forbes magazine and ranked number 36 overall. The University is efficient in terms of spending per student, a characteristic that Forbes rewards but U.S. News punishes. The University was considered financially stable in a recent study that was released by Bain & Sterling Partners, and UVA has triple A bond ratings from all three rating agencies. Ms. Sullivan said the University is not in a financial crisis; the University’s endowment is skillfully managed and many alumni are passionately engaged.

Ms. Sullivan said there is great strength in the residential undergraduate program and several of the University’s professional programs are among the best in the country. Collaboration is an important key for the future as a relatively small research university, as it will allow the University to play in a league with larger institutions. In May, a grounds-wide summit on “big data” took place, and a proposal came out of that for more than 100 faculty members to create an institute whose focus would be large data, its assembly, its security, its analysis, and its modeling. An institute like this would not replace existing departments, but it would give faculty from a variety of disciplinary homes the opportunity to propose new research and develop new analytic tools. The institute would allow students to create a certificate in data that could then define a major. The problem of turning data into information looms large for science, industry, and government. It would provide a rich source of internships, research, and post-graduation jobs for students.

The faculty’s enthusiasm for experimenting to build a better University has led to an amazing number and diversity of
technology enhanced courses. This summer a Faculty Senate task force of some 49 faculty members produced an initial inventory, and they have a fuller survey underway. The initial four-course offering on Coursera in January already has more than 30,000 registrations, and the first two courses by tele-presence through the 4VA Consortium will become available this fall. A small grants program from the Faculty Senate will produce at least ten new hybrid courses this fall. An overall assessment of these courses has been designed in order to know what works and what does not.

Ms. Sullivan addressed weaknesses and threats she sees for the University. The long-term secular decline in state appropriations is baked into the University’s financial models and despite the efforts of the General Assembly and the governor to approve appropriations this year, unavoidable costs were passed on to the University. These costs absorb all increases in state appropriations and also two points of the 3.7% tuition increase. Resulting from this is a growing issue with faculty salaries. Federal deficit reduction may also have effects in terms of research, support for the hospital, and student financial aid. Federal sequestration will bring very serious issues for the University’s research portfolio, for medical care, and for some types of financial aid.

Ms. Sullivan said because of the rapid changes in the healthcare industry, monitoring the environment of the Medical Center will be important. She also said that advanced offerings in master’s and Ph.D. programs need further examination.

Ms. Sullivan addressed three big priorities needing immediate attention in the upcoming academic year:

1. Faculty Salaries: Ms. Sullivan said she will bring the Board a four-year plan for raising faculty salaries at the next meeting. This will require a commitment by the Board in concert with the University’s foundations to elevate faculty salaries in the future.

2. Faculty Replacement: Over the next ten years, a large fraction of faculty will need to be replaced because of retirement. A small increase in the total number of faculty will be required to account for enrollment growth. To do this, ensuring the financial resources of faculty salaries and revising the way in which faculty are recruited will be important.

3. The quality program of the Medical Center is also of great urgency as the scope of success must be increased moving forward.
Ms. Sullivan closed by expressing her disappointment in the lack of progress made during the previous year in moving toward a new internal financial model.

Admission Report

The Rector introduced Gregory Roberts, Dean of Admission, to present an extensive report on undergraduate admission.

Mr. Roberts thanked the Board for the opportunity to present. He said that the University does not admit numbers, but people. A change in demographics has occurred in admission as more applications are seen each year. This trend is not because more students are applying to college, but simply students are applying to more schools. The Office of Admission is seeing more minority students, and the office is focused on developing ways to recruit the various populations. Competing financially with scholarships is also important, as the cost of college is a concern for many students and families.

Mr. Roberts explained that there are no quotas they have to meet, or targets for schools or regions of the Commonwealth or other states. They look at everything a student submits with a thorough, fair, and comprehensive review.

Various changes have occurred in admission nationwide; it is a very competitive market. Some universities hire consultants to manage their brand campaigns, and now students are using consultants to craft or help them craft their applications. This makes it difficult to determine the authenticity of some applications. Data mining and projective modeling are both used in efforts to determine how many offers to make yearly. He said they have difficulty attracting the very best students because they are competing with the Ivy League schools, and they have difficulty recruiting minority students, partly because of financial resources available to the students.

Mr. Roberts emphasized the relationship between admission and aid. Coordination is crucial. Communication with prospects has changed with social media and they are trying to keep up. A new customer relations module is being installed, which will allow targeted students to receive customized messages.

Mr. Roberts reviewed statistics on competing schools and offer rates. In 2010 the offer rate was 32%; it is now down to 29%. For out-of-state students it is about 24%. The offer rate is used by U.S. News, as is the yield, and some schools do things to manipulate these percentages. He said early decision is a way to manipulate yield because a school can report 100% yield with binding early decision. Also, schools will encourage weaker students to apply, only to turn them down, which boosts their applications and lowers the offer rate even though they had no
Mr. Roberts said he would like to see more formal coordination of efforts among the divisions that impact enrollment and retention. Issues the University community is discussing right now include enrollment growth, tuition increases, a new budget model, and Access UVa. He suggested that bringing together under one umbrella all the divisions and units in the University that are impacted by the ultimate decisions regarding these issues would be beneficial.

Mr. Roberts reviewed data regarding application numbers and class strength and explained the early action process. Applications have doubled since 2003. This is partially explained by moving to the Common Application in 2008-2009 and early action this past year. There has also been a dramatic increase in SAT scores, 1322 to 1351 in five years, with 93% in the top decile of their high school class. He also touched on the Echols Scholars program, explaining that it helps attract very qualified individuals to the University. He said next steps include evaluating the early action process after three years and reassessing its effectiveness in bringing in the pool of candidates we want to attract.

Mr. Roberts took questions, and a couple of members expressed their view that early action decisions ought to be made before January 1 when other applications are due. A decision in December might convince students not to apply elsewhere. Mr. Roberts said this might negatively affect the offer rate because many of these students are applying binding early decision elsewhere and so the University is wasting offers on them. By late January those students have dropped out of the pool. He said this is the first year, and we need three years of experience to evaluate the program effectively.

Higher Education Advisory Committee

President Sullivan provided an overview of the Higher Education Opportunity Act. The act was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in 2011. It creates policy and a framework for investment or reinvestment and innovation in higher education. It provides some guidelines for incentive-based funding, economic impact innovation, need-based financial aid, enrollment growth funding based on per-student increased enrollment, and for base operations and instruction. The Higher Education Advisory Committee was formed out of the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

The legislation has a number of objectives including overall growth in the number of Virginians who have college
degrees, an emphasis on financial aid for both low and middle income students, increasing degree completion in a timely or expedited fashion, making better use of physical facilities of colleges and universities, improving retention and graduation rates, and improving degree production in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields. Another objective is increasing research in health fields, including more public and private collaboration, sharing in instructional resources, more technology and enhanced instruction, and providing paths for students who had partial credit or community college credit to transfer into four-year degree programs.

Ms. Sullivan mentioned the six-year plan. There are various changes required for each institution; one of the requirements is taking into consideration the stated objectives of the Higher Education Opportunity Act legislation and the strategies that will help achieve those objectives. It is imperative that financial aid, use of facilities and instructional resources, cost efficiencies in encouraging student completion, how resources are shared with other institutions, and any new programs or initiatives, are addressed. With regard to finance, basic information about the operating budget, tuition and fees, and any tuition waivers must be provided.

Ms. Sullivan said she is a member of the Higher Education Advisory Committee, which is charged with providing advice and making recommendations about the funding methodology and criteria for low and middle income students, developing objective performance criteria for financial incentives, and metrics in economic opportunity, determining if any additional authority should be granted under restructuring, considering the role of non-public institutions in higher education, and assessing the degree to which the Commonwealth’s system of higher education is meeting its objectives. The members are appointed by the governor and represent the state administration, the legislature, SCHEV, public and private institutions of higher education, and business leaders. The committee meets 11 times a year and work from 2011 includes the funding model, financial aid definitions, and additional autonomy under restructuring.

President Sullivan said a work plan for 2012 has been laid out and the next meeting will be August 27th in Richmond.

Legislative Proposal

President Sullivan presented a legislative proposal for the Board’s consideration. In 2012 the General Assembly created a hybrid retirement program for state employees, effective January 1, 2014, to replace the current defined benefit retirement program administered by VRS.
The University seeks to propose legislation in 2013 that would amend Section 51.145 of the Code of Virginia by striking language that imposes surcharges on employees enrolled in a defined contribution retirement plan or an optional retirement plan. This provision would impact all institutions of higher education that have employees enrolled in a defined contribution retirement plan by passing the cost of funding the Commonwealth's defined benefit program to employers of faculty and staff who are not, and for the most part, have never been enrolled in the VRS defined benefit plan. Covering the unfunded liability in the legacy defined benefit plan in this manner will increase the cost of education and health care, and have negative effects on future tuition and fees and patient billing rates.

APPROVAL OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO AMEND CODE OF VIRGINIA SECTION 51.1-145

RESOLVED, the Board of Visitors approves and endorses amending the Code of Virginia as it pertains to the hybrid defined benefit and defined contribution retirement program.

The proposed amendments to § 51.1-145 of the Code of Virginia are as follows:

§ 51.1-145. Employer contributions.

N. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the total employer contribution for each employer, expressed as a percentage of the employer's payroll for such period, shall be established as the contribution rate payable by such employer with respect to its employees enrolled in the defined benefit plan established under this chapter. The employer's contribution shall be first applied to the defined contribution component of the hybrid retirement program described in § 51.1-169, and the remainder shall be deposited in the employer's retirement allowance account. Institutions of higher education shall also pay contributions to the employer's retirement allowance account in amounts representing the difference between the contribution rate payable with respect to employees enrolled in the defined benefit plan under this chapter and the employer contributions paid to any optional retirement plan it offers on behalf of any of its nonfaculty Covered Employees, as described in Article 6 (§ 23-38.114 et seq.) of Chapter 4.10 of Title 23. The employer contribution rate established for each employer may include the annual rate of contribution payable to such employer with respect to employees enrolled in the optional defined contribution retirement plans established under §§ 51.1-126, 51.1-126.1, 51.1-126.3, and 51.1-126.4.
The Rector thanked Dr. MacTaggart for his guidance and thanked President Sullivan and her staff for their work.

On motion, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan G. Harris
Secretary
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Let me begin by acknowledging the many difficulties of the last few months. I again offer my sincere and personal apology for the controversies that, at best, have been distractions from the important work ahead of us.

Even though we are not gathered in his beloved Albemarle County today, the words of Thomas Jefferson are never far from mind. He once advised that one should "Take things always by their smooth handle." These words should guide us all as we return to where we started prior to June of this year—with a focus on the people we all agree are paramount—the University’s students and our medical center patients.

Many have noted that today really affords us a chance to take that smooth handle, to reconcile our differences, rejuvenate our leadership and reshape our future outcomes. Thank you for showing the courage and commitment to do so.

My hope for this retreat is that we can lay a foundation for collective and collaborative success ...

that we sow seeds to join together and find true common ground with President Sullivan, the university community, alumni and the greater community of Virginia citizens ...

and that it leads us to a plan and vision that bring to fruition our shared dreams and hopes for this great institution, the University of Virginia.

U.Va. is the best public university in America --and thank you Forbes Magazine for confirming it again so recently. Many measures tell us that U.Va. is an outstanding educational asset.

Yet, we are neither exempt from-- nor oblivious to-- the winds of change.
We live in a time where the traditional operating principles and the possible future of higher education generate serious debate and questioning. Major shifts are afoot affecting sustainable funding, educational delivery and academic quality.

These shifts and trends afford new challenges and new opportunities, including the chance for this Board to rethink its own historical systems and procedures, some of which may now be out of date.

It's also about the pace of change.

Several experts, including the Aspen Institute and others, believe that as much as half of what undergraduates learn, especially in science, technology and engineering, could be obsolete by graduation -- even with the best faculty and the most cutting-edge thinking.

These perspectives offer just another example among countless others that illustrate how the pace of change has accelerated. Deciding if, when and how to react or even proactively plan can be a complicated labyrinth to navigate.

Similarly, many on the Board and in higher education circles have expressed a keen awareness of how this Board stays apace in such a dynamic environment. It behooves us to constantly seek and value productive suggestions from those who love U.Va. on Grounds and around the state.

It's an exciting, challenging moment-- and, for all of us, one that requires constant learning and vigilance to help us contribute constructively to U.Va.

For example, our new Board committees on Strategic Planning and Governance and Engagement provide the means to consider the University's aspirations, assets and priorities through the lens of collaboration, responsiveness and inspired leadership.

Over the next day and a half, Dr. MacTaggart is going to offer ideas and invite great discussion about how and where we should focus our energies. He will help us begin to renew and refresh our processes, leading to a collective, deeper appreciation of the complexities of the issues, one that
increases our capacity to thoughtfully respond in an atmosphere of transparency and mutual accountability.

Strategic Planning chairs Frank Atkinson and Linwood Rose will offer for consideration and discussion some excellent ideas on how to approach our very critical strategic planning work. And all of our committees will reflect on how they can contribute to strategic planning and responsible oversight.

Tomorrow we will dive into a series of important reports from the President as well updates on legislative issues and student admissions. While the Governor was unable to join us, we will hear more about the work of his Higher Education Advisory Committee. His recent letter to the Board of Visitors calls us to continue to "innovate, collaborate, and reduce operating costs."

Another great reminder that this is no ordinary time.

Thank you for your resolute commitment and your willingness to join together, to take that smooth handle. Let's build a solid foundation, one that thoughtfully reflects today's realities while creatively supporting U.Va.'s future dreams.