

UC OIR Strategic Plan

This powerpoint summarizes the history of the developing charge and schedule for the UC OIR Strategic Plan.

V1.0: presented to UCOAC on Oct 8, 2012

V2.0: changes reflect UCOAC input: set priorities among the charge points, establish milestones and schedule, and format for intermediate report in January.

UC OIR Strategic Plan

History

- * Lick strategic plan 2008; Keck strategic plan 2009
- * Broad consensus emerges that a more holistic view is needed: Keck, TMT, Lick, and UCO shops
- * ATF calls for **two** strategic planning processes:
 - One under aegis of Academic Council (loosely, now the UCO Board)
 - Broad view: “UC activities in the broadest range of fields that leverage existing shared facilities in the UC system”.
 - UCO makes strategic plan for next year and decade for shared OIR facilities
- * External Review Committee calls for **one** planning process: UCO Board “reviews approves annual program plans and longer-range (5 years) strategic plans.”
- * Meanwhile, extraordinary budget pressures mandate most efficient use of \$\$\$.

External Review Committee had strong recommendations on strategic planning for UCO

Quotes from ERC:

- *Fabrication of instruments for TMT will require significant upgrades to the Santa Cruz laboratory facilities...The UCLA Infrared Laboratory also needs enhanced levels of support.*
- *Prudent for UCO and UC to consider carefully the long-term obligations that entry into TMT will entail, and likely impacts it will have on infrastructure and staffing of UCO.*
- *Long-term future of Lick Observatory should be critically examined as part of a strategic planning exercise.*
- *We did not fully examine the rationale for maintaining current number (14) of “80/20” positions, but are concerned that eventually the cost of maintaining this level of staffing will compete with other UCO priorities.*
 - *This issue should be addressed as part of our recommended strategic planning process, in the context of future needs in the TMT+Keck era.*

Strategic Planning Objectives (draft v2)

Assumptions:

- Budgets will continue to be very tight so that it is particularly important to make sure that each dollar spent has maximum value.
 - The strategic plan should be consistent with ATF/ERC priorities.
- 1) Main plan should focus on next 5 years but look ahead to TMT era (10 years).
 - 2) Plan should establish a set of goals and desired outcomes with appropriate actions and timescales.
 - 3) Plan should evaluate UC strengths and weaknesses vs. outside competition and designate clear areas where UC should aspire to be world-leading.
 - 4) Plan should match faculty to resources to achieve maximum efficiency.
 - 5) Plan should be realistic regarding needed personnel, facilities, support requirements, and costs.
 - 6) Plan should outline a realistic revenue strategy that UC can support over the long term.
 - 7) Plan should identify areas where UC scientific and technical investments are required.
 - 8) Plan should consider the operation of Keck, Mt Hamilton, UCO, and TMT as an organic whole.

Strategic Planning Process (draft v2)

- 1) Plan should be directly produced by UC astronomers.
- 2) The SP committee is appointed jointly by the UCO Director and the UCOAC and reports to these entities.
- 3) The SP committee will consult widely with UC astronomers and within the wider UC community, including UC administrators with interest in and experience with the UC OIR astronomy program.
- 4) The SP committee will solicit white papers, conduct polls, and organize regional meetings (north and south) and topical workshops (e.g., Mt Hamilton, Keck, TMT).
- 5) The SP committee will consult closely with the Keck and TMT SAC co-chairs and with representatives from Caltech astronomy. Other TMT partners?
- 6) The SP committee should be provided with support through the UCO Director's office to enable it to carry out its task and to be provided with timely information about the Observatory.

Strategic Planning Membership and Schedule

MEMBERSHIP:

- 1) Approximately 12 UC astronomers from all 8 astronomy campuses and the DOE labs.
- 2) One member from each campus and one additional member from campuses that are most heavily invested in OIR facilities (e.g., UCSC, UCLA, UCB).
- 3) UC administrators??? E.g., Peggy Delaney, VCPB from UCSC. Or someone more neutral?
- 4) Non-voting representatives from the Keck and TMT projects and additional consultants with specific expertise as necessary.
- 5) Emphasis on scientists with experience on major instrumentation projects and the organization and operation of major facilities and projects.
- 6) Chair to be selected jointly by the UCO director and chair of UCOAC. Vice chair to be selected by Chair.

SCHEDULE:

- 1) Interim/preliminary report stating high-level goals and strategies by mid-January 2013.
- 1) Final report to be submitted to the UCO Director and UCOAC by May 1, 2013.
- 2) Both reports to be copied to the UCO Board.

Format of interim report (draft v2)

Here is a proposed format for the mid-January 2013 interim report. A suggestion is that the interim report explore options, which would then be discussed and evaluated by the UC community. A final scenario would be developed in the final report, due in May. Option topics for January include:

- 1) Options for the structure of the UCO faculty positions.
- 2) Mt. Hamilton operation options, with levels of service and associated budget.
- 3) Options for enhancing Keck performance.
- 4) UCO activities in the TMT era.
- 5) Expenditure scenarios combining the various options.
- 6) Review of potential revenue sources.