

Dear CBE College Council and Colleagues:

We, the CBE Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee offer the following report as completing the charge of the CBE College Council to the 2012 CBE Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee. This document represents our thinking about how we, the CBE community, might coalesce around a response to the 2Y2D UW Challenge. We have approached the challenge in a proactive manner that we feel will strengthen and enhance our College community and its shared vision.

- This document is presented to move the College ahead in a strategic manner for the period 2012-2020. The Plan is one of a series of milestones in a process of continued college-wide renewal.
- We have tried to be simultaneously respectful and bold. Please read the document in that light.
- We are presenting this plan as a reasonable strategic plan; we are not suggesting that all details have been resolved or are equally supported, or that we have considered all alternatives and/or consequences; We are proposing a plan as a living document that is reflected upon and renewed annually within CBE.
- We know that, ultimately, members of the Committee will take responsibility for the concepts and ideas proposed in this document while recognizing that to be successful we must engage the entire College in the implementation plan.

To remind you, the charge of the Ad Hoc Committee was:

- To develop an actionable set of strategic CBE alternatives in response to 2Y2D
- To incorporate the priorities and themes outlined in the retreat of May 7th, 2011
- To improve CBE teaching, research and service
- To promote stronger integration of programs.

During our January 26, 2012 meeting with Dean Friedman, he asked us to "define and articulate our academic priorities", challenging us to suggest a statement defining, "how we should be talking about what we do".

The process has been - and will continue to be - as important as the product of the committee (outlined below). This letter assumes that the College Council and the entire faculty will review the proposals presented in our report. We understand that the entire College Faculty will discuss and vote on adopting the Plan during our upcoming Spring 2012 retreat.

Background

We are at a moment of both significant challenges, threats and rare opportunities represented by perceived uncertainties regarding our future, general threats to higher education, challenging internal University of Washington economic structures that dis-incentivize collaboration through activity based budgeting, as opposed to 21st century professional outlooks that are built on trans-disciplinary collaboration, and an astonishing range and quality of knowledge and resources within our College. It has never been more essential to reinforce the *value* of the whole of our college to the University and the larger community, and we have never been better qualified to do so. The Committee found these challenges offer a perfect opportunity to shape a CBE narrative defining the synergies and potential integration of our disciplines and professions. This opportunity should inspire us to engage our mission and forge leadership roles in addressing some of most challenging issues of our time. We have the opportunity to ask ourselves: "What does it mean to be a College - a College of Built Environments - *as a constellation of professions, practices, and intellectual pursuits collectively addressing the grand challenges of the 21st century?*"

When we began our work we recognized the natural temptation to fortify, protect, and retreat to the respective disciplines, departments, and professions that we have worked hard to define. We challenged this temptation, signaling our interest in responding to change, and in actions that allow us to explore the potential for our disciplines and scholarship to come together through cooperative, collaborative approaches that enhance the roles we will play in meeting the needs of an increasingly urbanized planet.

We have not focused on our individual departments and programs. We believe fortification and balkanization will not only fail us individually, but will *threaten the survival of our greatest strength: our collective nature, our ability to grow together and to address—as a constellation of professions, practices, and intellectual pursuits—the immense challenges of the built environments, the societies they support and all that they embody*. As a committee we have concluded that *the grand challenges of the 21st century are beyond the capabilities of any one discipline, department, program or specialized practice. Together we are charged to contribute to the shared and responsible advocacy, creation and stewardship of built environments that respond to the social, economic, and environmental challenges of our increasingly complex global society.*

We propose that we approach CBE not merely as a school of diverse professional degrees centered on built environments, but rather as a college engaged in the creation, research, and transfer i.e., teaching and service, of knowledge in the full cycle of creating, constructing, and operating built environments. We share a fundamental process of inquiry, synthesis, and problem solving, or - in simpler terms – we are a community of research and application, of discovery and of doing. Without exception each of us is geared toward improving the quality of built environments and in turn the ways in which such improvements contribute to society as a whole. However, to fully achieve this potential, we must move outside of our familiar territories and silos. We propose to expand and enrich our definition of what it means to engage in the planning, design, construction, development and research of built environments in a manner consistent with the mission of the University of Washington:

We discover timely solutions to the world's most complex problems and enrich the lives of people throughout our community, the state of Washington, the nation and the world.

Committee Composition and Process

The committee is composed of three elected representatives from the faculty of each department. In addition, the committee chair is a member of the College Council and a full-time senior faculty member in the Department of Architecture. CBE staff representatives and our dean have participated in some of the meetings. Meetings have been open and additional faculty and staff have attended on occasion. To create greater transparency, an open Catalyst site was created and access information was disseminated to faculty and staff through representatives of the committee.

Weekly meetings and additional discussions by smaller working groups allowed members to engage in an extensive investigation into the Ad Hoc Committee charge. This involved significant reflection and discussion of what it has meant to be a college and, more importantly, what it could mean going forward. The committee developed a strong rapport and a more in-depth interdisciplinary understanding of our various components and our collective whole. While sometimes chaotic and messy, the dialog fostered an open and inclusive discussion that helped us to understand and appreciate the diversity of disciplinary cultures within the College. We approached the task as representatives of the collective faculty of CBE, rather than merely of our departments. That is not to say that the views of individual departments and programs were not well represented, but rather that they subtly gave way to a more collaborative approach. Through a collective effort our understanding of the challenges and opportunities before us benefited from a much deeper appreciation for one-another's perspectives and allowed us to establish a working relationship founded on trust and common values. We feel that this type of messy, oft-chaotic cross-disciplinary exploratory dialog focused on solutions and advances in knowledge is the very essence of the spirit we need to foster in the College; it is one that will allow us to remain focused around global challenges as defined in the 2011 CBE retreat.

Lastly, within the closing days of our committee's work, there developed a specific concern for how activity based budgeting (ABB) might affect our plans for the future. As is the case with many units on campus under ABB, some units within CBE are more financially vulnerable than others. Members of the committee emphasize that ABB if implemented down to a department or program level will most probably increase competition for resources and drive departments apart. It is the feeling of the committee that while all units should be doing all they can to be financially viable within the general realities of ABB, the initial 3-5 year implementation period for ABB must provide disproportional support for the more vulnerable units in order to maintain the whole of our college. We as a committee strongly support a holistic CBE resource allocation process that subsidizes the less viable units through this initial ABB implementation period, with the long-range goal of each unit developing a plan for increased financial viability within the constraints of ABB.

Please visit our CBE shared website: <http://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/rbpena/25519>

We have appreciated the trust you have shown us by electing us to the Ad Hoc Committee and very much look forward to expanding this dialogue with you.

With sincerest regards,

The CBE Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee: Branden Born, Carrie Dossick, Jim DeLisle, Daniel Friedman (Dean, Ex officio) Kimo Griggs, Young-Woo Kim, Joel Loveland (Chair) Lynn Manzo, Rick Mohler, Bob Mugerauer, Kamran Nemati, Gundula Proksch, Ben Spencer, Thaisa Way