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AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. OPENING REMARKS (Messrs. Atkinson and Rose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. PRELIMINARY REPORT FROM THE ART &amp; SCIENCE GROUP, LLC (Ms. Sullivan to introduce Mr. Ben Edwards; Mr. Edwards to report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED STRATEGIC PRIORITIES (Ms. Sullivan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. DISCUSSION (Messrs. Atkinson and Rose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEETING: May 21, 2013

COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Strategic Planning

AGENDA ITEM: I. Opening Remarks

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: The co-chairs will welcome guests and provide an overview of the meeting agenda.
BACKGROUND: In their letter of September 3, 2012, Committee co-chairs Frank Atkinson and Lin Rose asked that the President undertake a strategic plan for the University and suggested the President "establish a steering committee and the necessary work groups to address the requirements" of the planning effort. Accordingly, President Sullivan established a steering committee and seven working groups to address those topics suggested by Messrs. Atkinson and Rose, as well as other topics of direct relevance to the future of the University. The seven working groups are: Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Development; Public University; Resources; Streamlining; Student Life (with a subgroup on Career Services); Synergy; and Technology.

Over the past three months, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and seven working groups shifted the focus of their work from identifying, soliciting, and generating ideas for consideration in the strategic plan to refining those ideas they considered most likely to address institutional needs and strengthen and differentiate the University.

Messrs. Atkinson and Rose also asked that the strategic planning process include a comprehensive institutional assessment conducted by "consultants experienced in higher education strategic assessment and planning." The Art & Science Group, LLC were retained through a competitive procurement process to conduct an independent environmental and academic assessment of the University of Virginia. The charge given to Art & Science Group included assessing the University's competitive position relative to its institutional goals, mission, and the environment in which it operates.
DISCUSSION: The working group’s emergent ideas that were shared with the Board in February were further refined in an iterative process that included solicitation of feedback from multiple constituency groups and revisions based on that feedback. Included in this feedback-revision process are: Steering Committee and working group members, deans, vice presidents, faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

The Faculty Senate hosted a “working meeting” at their March meeting with members of the Strategic Planning working groups in attendance. Faculty considered the emergent ideas and provided direct feedback on the ideas. The deans provided an intellectual and aspirational framework from which the emergent ideas could be further developed. The deans, working with the Provost, continue to provide leadership and critical input on the priorities that will constitute the strategic plan.

Student members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and working groups developed a strategic planning awareness and marketing campaign in which they sought to engage the entire student body in the strategic planning process. Their campaign “Imagine UVA” used social media and traditional marketing techniques to increase awareness of strategic planning. They also organized and hosted focus groups and a student open forum to solicit ideas and feedback directly from their fellow students from all schools.

In April, an online strategic planning survey was sent to all University alumni to solicit alumni input on issues and ideas being considered among working groups. Survey findings will be considered as the strategic plan is further developed.

Concurrent with, but independent of, the work of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and working groups, The Art & Science Group conducted their internal academic assessment of the University, an external assessment of the higher education environment, and a comparative assessment of nine peer institutions.

University officials, in consultation with the Art & Science Group, identified nine peer institutions for inclusion in the competitive peer assessment. These institutions were selected based on several criteria including: those with whom the University competes in undergraduate admissions and faculty recruiting, institutional mission, scope of academic and research operations, and institutional standing in national rankings. The nine comparative peer institutions, comprised of
four public universities and five private universities, are: University of California, Berkeley (Berkeley), University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), University of Michigan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University, New York University, University of Chicago, and Vanderbilt University.

The four components of the assessment included: examination of internal and external data and documents; over 100 interviews of University officials including all members of the Board of Visitors, deans, department chairs, vice presidents, vice provosts, and other senior administrators; examination of strategic priorities at nine comparison universities; and interviews with higher education thought-leaders and senior officials at the comparison institutions.

The Art & Science Group submitted a preliminary draft of their assessment at the end of April. Mr. Edwards will provide a preliminary report of assessment findings and the implications of those findings as they relate to the University’s strategic plan.
BOARD MEETING: May 21, 2013

COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Strategic Planning

AGENDA ITEM: III. Presentation of Proposed Strategic Priorities

ACTION REQUIRED: None

BACKGROUND: In their September 3, 2012 letter to President Sullivan, committee co-chairs Messrs. Atkinson and Rose asked the President to engage the Board when certain milestones of the planning process are attained. During the February 22, 2013 meeting of the Board of Visitor’s Special Committee on Strategic Planning, President Sullivan expressed her intention to present to the Board for their comment a list of strategic priorities that would differentiate the University. Committee co-chairs Messrs. Atkinson and Rose and several other Board members agreed with this course of action.

DISCUSSION: President Sullivan will present several proposed strategic priorities for Board members to consider. The priorities being presented are those that best capitalize on the University’s strengths, address the University’s competitive position and weaknesses as identified in the Art & Science Group’s assessment findings, and enhance opportunities for future sustained excellence and differentiation.