Report and Recommendations
of the
Executive Education Working Group

March 5, 2018

Berkeley
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

At the beginning of the 2017-18 academic year, Chancellor Carol Christ and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Paul Alivisatos asked Vice Provost and Dean Fiona Doyle to Chair a working group that would assess executive educational offerings at Berkeley and make recommendations on ways to increase Berkeley's executive education footprint.

The working group identified a number of opportunities for making Berkeley stronger through further development of executive education across a wide variety of schools and colleges, including new partnerships between units. The following report begins with a brief discussion of what executive education is, and is not; a brief history of campus educational offerings for non-matriculated students; and a summary of the current status of executive education at Berkeley. The remainder of the report provides a set of proposed principles for format, quality, and governance of executive education, and turns to a set of next steps and recommendations that include, among others: structured sharing of best practices across units; cost-effective means of relaxing existing constraints on growth (e.g., providing access to high-end teaching space more widely); models for successful partnerships; and successful approaches for supporting faculty engagement.

Summary of Recommendations:

- Convene a standing council of executive education providers that meets quarterly to share best practices, develop market opportunities and address any channel conflicts.

- Consider adopting the UDAR model of assigning prospects and donors to relationship managers for prospecting executive education clients.

- Work toward a unified umbrella brand image for Berkeley's executive education offerings.

- Explore the feasibility of acquiring and deploying a Customer Relationship Management software solution for relationship management.

- The working group does not recommend assigning specific entitlements (industries or professions) to specific campus executive education providers for exclusive marketing rights, because of the breadth of potential interest of a given client.

- Long-term recommendation: explore donor or private partner interest in developing an executive education facility, ideally with overnight lodging, on campus.

Introduction

The University of California, Berkeley, is globally recognized as a prestigious research university with comprehensive excellence in undergraduate, doctoral, and professional graduate education; with stellar research contributions and a longstanding commitment to public service. It also has a long tradition of offering educational programs to non-matriculated students, until the 1990s through UC Berkeley Extension. These educational programs comprised continuing education and international programs, along with the Concurrent Enrollment program that provides access to Berkeley's academic courses that have available seats. Over the last 20 or so years there has been an increasing global demand for formal professional education, both professional graduate degrees, and also non-degree programs that are more structured than traditional continuing education programs. There has also been a pronounced interest in programs targeted at senior employees working in specific sectors – loosely referred to as executive education.

Many of Berkeley's professional schools and colleges have responded to this increasing interest in executive education in an ad hoc manner, often responding to specific inquiries with custom programs, rather than strategically planning a portfolio of offerings, or seeking additional clients who may have an interest in programs that have already been developed. It is becoming evident that the ad hoc approach is less than optimal. There are many market areas where Berkeley could be a strong player, yet has no programming. Conversely, there are other areas where there is potential for counterproductive overlap or competition by different academic units that results in a less-than optimal experience for clients, and wasted effort at Berkeley.

It was evident to the task force that there are many potential benefits from deeper and broader engagement in executive education. It has the potential to support a stronger faculty at Berkeley, particularly in professional schools, since the income from teaching in these programs can be important for recruitment and retention of those who have relevant expertise and strong aptitude. Executive education has significant potential to bring in much-needed revenue. Executive education programs can enhance Berkeley's visibility and reputation with prospective employers of our graduates. Such programs may provide valuable service, particularly to governments and the not-for-profit sectors. Executive education provides an opportunity to engage or re-engage with potential donors. Moreover, thousands of people who would otherwise have no direct experience of Berkeley become connected through participating in our executive education programs.

At the same time, however, there are also potential drawbacks to, and constraints on, deeper participation in executive education, given the significant demands already being made of our faculty, staff, facilities and infrastructure. Not all faculty have the expertise needed for typical executive education offerings, and of those who do, some may not have instructional styles that align with the specific expectations of the targeted audiences, who are usually paying a premium, and have commensurate expectations. Given that executive education is usually done on "consulting days", which are limited for ladder-rank faculty under APM 025, it is evident that a significant expansion of executive educational offerings would require non-ladder rank instructors. There are also constraints on the extent to which our executive education offerings can expand in terms of our available infrastructure, particularly premium classroom space. This constraint is likely to become even more severe with increasing enrollments of undergraduates and professional students. While one remedy for this problem is to offer executive education off-campus, either in neighboring Bay Area locations or even at the offices of the client, many clients value being physically present on the Berkeley campus, interacting with Berkeley faculty, staff, and students. Although executives are not competing directly with Berkeley students for housing, there are times when it is challenging to line up housing for executive education clients.

The working group was assembled to consider these issues, and make recommendations for a roadmap that would guide future activities in executive education, and ensure that these align with other plans for the campus. The working group concluded that because of Berkeley's global reputation, the scale of future executive education endeavors is unlikely to be limited by client demand. The bigger limitation is that substantial institutional investments would be necessary to expand executive education offerings significantly beyond their current scale. In addition to physical infrastructural needs, Berkeley would need: marketing and customer-management systems; registration and payment systems; program management; business development; budgeting and contracts; content development and course design; legal, etc. Additionally, a nimble operating structure that can respond quickly to market opportunities may require setting up a management entity outside of Berkeley's academic structure.

Definitions of Executive Education and Associated Terms

It was apparent to the working group early in its deliberations that the term "executive education" means different things to different people. Arriving at common definitions of executive education and associated terms is challenging. Under the narrowest definition, executive education is the top-tier offering of non-degree, advanced business/policy education. However, this definition fails to recognize education and training geared toward the top tier of leaders in governmental, non-governmental, public service, medical, and education sectors, for which Berkeley's professional schools and colleges have an excellent reputation.

The different nomenclature for professional titles in different sectors makes it impractical to segment the market for professional education on the basis of job title. Many sectors, such as education and non-profits, have senior employees who consider themselves "leaders," not "executives."

Describing executive education as a premium-priced offering is also sector-specific. Whereas many businesses will pay more than $1,000 per person per day for high-quality executive education well-aligned with their needs, this price is unrealistic for many other sectors, where budgets are constrained and scrutinized by the public and lawmakers. While it could be said that executive education targets the top decision-makers in their respective fields, the price points in different industries are dramatically different.

Given Berkeley's core values of accessibility and commitment to societal benefit, it is important to include not-for-profits and governmental organizations among our clients for "executive education." At the same time, academic units must be disciplined about assessing the true cost of such offerings. Given the other demands on the time of the Berkeley faculty and staff associated with our core mission, there must be compelling non-financial benefits to justify an academic unit offering executive education that cannot generate net operating surplus. And it is crucial that public funding allocated for Berkeley's matriculated students should not be inadvertently diverted to executive education.

For the sake of discussion, the working group arrived at the following definitions, which are used in this report:

Continuing education is an all-encompassing term describing formal learning activities that are generally not focused on a college degree outcome, but are geared towards individuals who have earned, at a minimum, a bachelor's degree.

Corporate education is an umbrella term that could include entry-level skills training, mid-level management training, and executive education – the term denotes a segment rather than the seniority of the audience in any program.

Executive Education is tailored for professionals with significant responsibilities for financial and human resources within their organizations. The focus is on leadership and keeping participants abreast of the latest developments, tools, and techniques in their professional fields.

Professional Continuing Education is offered to maintain professional certification and licensing in fields such as health, law, and accounting. Practitioners are required to take a certain number of units or hours of continuing education on a regular basis to maintain their professional licenses.

Historic Role of Berkeley in Educating Non-Matriculated Students

UC Extension

Since 1891, UC Extension has worked with departments and faculty to extend the research and scholarship of the university to the public. Extension engaged the community by connecting our campus and faculty to Extension students and businesses, and helped build the local workforce by providing education and training in emerging skills that were in demand by employers.

The University of California Office of the President decentralized University Extension in 1967, placing each Chancellor in control of continuing education on their campus. In 1968, Governor Pat Brown eliminated the last vestige of state support for Extension. In 1972, UC's Council of Chancellors issued the "Policy on Administration of Continuing Education Programs" which stated that *"University Extension shall be responsible for programming and administration of all continuing education programs [directed] to other than students formally registered in the University's degree programs."*

Given this policy framework, UC Extension's current audience includes:

- High school and non-matriculated college students who take undergraduate-level courses for academic credit
- Post-baccalaureate students who enroll in graduate and professional school preparation programs
- Working professionals who subscribe to professional certificates and specialized programs to facilitate career advancement and career change
- Corporate clients interested in custom programs that develop their workforce
- Lifelong learners looking for personal enrichment opportunities.

Under new leadership beginning in 2007-08, Extension's strategic plan as approved by the Chancellor and EVCP called for pursuing revenue-generating markets without sacrificing academic quality. One of four market segments identified as a focus area was corporate training and contract education. At that time, there was the well-recognized trend of increased commitment by employers to workforce training.

Also, at that time, Extension had tracked more than seventy inquiries for corporate training in a five-month period. Extension had not been responding to these requests with proposals and was leaving much of the corporate training market unserved. In the following years, Extension built up the capacity to serve that market and meet its needs through sponsored enrollment, open enrollment, and custom programs, leveraging its relative agility and the strengths of the University.

Berkeley Executive Education

The Haas School of Business started developing its executive education offerings in earnest in the late 1980s. It naturally focused on the Haas faculty's content expertise: management; business leadership; and business strategy. From the beginning it offered both custom programs for specific clients and open enrollment programs for the wider public. Today, Haas offers clients subject-matter expertise in business and management, with a majority of executive education programs focused on Leadership, Finance, Entrepreneurship, and Strategy.

Given that Extension had a business and management practice area, by 1996 the deans of the Haas School and Extension recognized the need for, and signed, an MOU that among other things segmented the target markets, with Extension focusing on middle manager, supervisory, and technical personnel; and the Haas School's domain being executives and upper-middle level managers. The 1996 MOU has been amended by mutual consent of the two Deans three times in the last 21 years (available at http://bit.ly/2CYGFI5). The current Extension and Haas School deans disagree about whether the existing MOU is still operative and are working to find mutually agreeable rules-of-the-road going forward.

In 2013, the Haas School received approval from the UC Regents and campus leadership to move its executive education operation into an affiliated 501(c)3 called Berkeley Executive Education (BEE). BEE's executive education currently contributes about $2 million per year to campus discretionary funds.

Current Executive Education Offerings at Berkeley

Berkeley's current executive and professional education offerings collectively generate an annual revenue of approximately $30 million; $24M from Berkeley Executive Education (Haas) and the remainder from other providers combined. The principal Berkeley executive education offerings are:

Berkeley Executive Education - Haas School of Business
Berkeley Executive Education is a separate 501(c)3 established to produce executive education for the Haas School of Business and the rest of campus. Programs are designed for established senior leaders and emerging managers. Custom and open-enrollment classes are offered on campus, at client locations, and online. Annual revenue is $24M.

College of Engineering
The College of Engineering offers custom and open enrollment courses to senior leaders in technical and engineering organizations. Classes are offered on campus and in Silicon Valley with occasional international offerings. Open enrollment courses typically span 2-3 days, while custom courses vary in duration. Annual revenue is approximately $2M.

Goldman School of Public Policy
GSPP offers custom programs to government agencies and NGO leaders from foreign nations. Week-long programs in leadership and management are taught on campus. Annual revenue is approximately $2M.

Graduate School of Journalism
Journalism operates the *Berkeley Advanced Media Institute*, offering instruction in digital media to content creators and information designers. Courses are on campus. Annual revenue is less than $1M.

School of Optometry
Optometry offers professional continuing education credits to practitioners to maintain their professional licenses. The School also offers online certification for optometrists to perform glaucoma procedures. Annual revenue is less than $1M.

Graduate School of Education
The Graduate School of Education offers skill development programs to principals, superintendents, and other education leaders in public schools. Annual revenue is less than $1M.

School of Public Health
The School of Public Health offers a Hospital Management Program (on-line) and a Physicians Leadership Program (in-person).

College of Natural Resources
CNR operates a 3-week summer institute on campus targeted towards international mid-career resource professionals. This program is partially supported by philanthropy and was originally launched in the spirit of public service. The college also offers several short programs throughout the year in subject areas such as the agricultural and food supply chain and the bio-economy. Annual revenue is less than $1M.

UC Berkeley Extension
Extension offers custom corporate programs to managers and individual contributors in leadership, business, technology, infoScience, project management, accounting, and finance. Courses range from half-day to on-going over the course of a year. Revenue is $2M.

Cross-Departmental Collaborations

In addition to executive and professional education programs offered by individual schools, colleges, or units, there are several examples of units collaborating to deliver a client experience that surpasses what any unit in isolation could have delivered. Cooperating, and even partnering, between units seems achievable and desirable whenever there is clear difference in client type or content between two units.

Partnership Example 1: Berkeley Exec Ed (BEE) & Greater Good Science Center
These two units have been collaborating for many years. For example, in 2016 they partnered to develop and deliver the *Chief Happiness and Positivity* program to the Prime Minister's office in the UAE. The program was well received; a second cohort of the program was offered in 2017. Total revenue for both cohorts was over $1.2 million. The Happiness partnership has led to further collaborations and possibilities under exploration currently.

Partnership Example 2: School of Public Health & BEE
In June 2017, these units completed the first *Berkeley Physician Leadership Program*, in partnership with a third entity, the Alameda Contra Costa Medical Association (ACCMA) sponsoring the program. The program was designed to provide leadership and management skills to help physicians navigate a dynamic healthcare sector and lead their own practices more effectively. These units will offer the second iteration of BPLP from March-June 2018. To fit into the lives of busy Bay Area physicians, this program takes place across a series of Saturday and Wednesday evening sessions, which makes it a nice complement in terms of calendaring to existing programs on both sides. The program is funded partially through a 2-year grant secured by ACCMA and partially by registration fees. To be sustainable, these units are exploring opportunities to grow the program, introducing more digital elements to expand reach and scheduling flexibility, and introducing new sponsorship revenues.

Partnership Example 3: College of Engineering & BEE
These two units are collaborating to offer a joint certificate program, *Commercialization of Disruptive Technology*, which combines the breadth of knowledge of two of UC Berkeley's outstanding academic units. The program leverages the strengths of both to guide participants seeking to understand, build, or expand a business driven by the latest disruptive technologies. Participants will take courses from COE (AR/VR, Design Thinking for IoT and more) and from the existing BEE open enrollment portfolio. Revenue for respective programs remains with COE and BEE, avoiding a separate revenue-sharing agreement. This program just launched, so results and financial impact are not yet known.

Partnership Example 4: Goldman School of Public Policy & Center for Studies in Higher Education
This was a one-time partnership in early 2017 designed to bring to a Goldman School client relationship specific expertise that was not as accessible through Goldman faculty alone. A fixed-sum was offered to the partnering unit to develop a fixed number of days with topics as required by the client. The partnership was viewed by both units as very successful—content delivered was of the highest quality and the client was delighted with the resulting offering.

Partnership Example 5: UC Berkeley Extension & Berkeley Law
These two units have begun collaborating recently. They partnered to co-market the 'BlockChain Unchained' event. The program was well received; Cohort 2 of the program is in 2018. Total revenue for both cohorts is expected to exceed $200,000. The partnership will lead to further collaborations between the two organizations.

Partnership Example 6: Consortium of smaller professional schools
During the fall semester, 2017, a group of professional school deans from Education, Environmental Design, Journalism, Public Policy, and Social Welfare have been working together with Assistant Dean of Public Policy Sudha Shetty to develop a set of programs that will be more suited to their clients than the types of programs offered in BEE or Extension. There is significant common ground and the very strong likelihood that the respective Deans will form a consortium of these schools for

delivering executive education programs. This consortium would be distinguished by primarily serving government, non-profits, the media, and other non-business clients. The price-point for these offerings would reflect the lower salary scales in these professions.

Future Landscape for Executive Education at Berkeley

There was strong agreement by members of the working group that Berkeley would be well served by being more deliberative and collaborative in building out and aligning its executive education offerings. At the core of this agreement was recognition that we must move from an approach centered on academic units, or pairs of units, to a client-centric approach that helps each client engage with those units that can best satisfy a specific need. It was agreed that this change in culture cannot happen overnight. Nonetheless, many guiding principles were identified that guide the way from our current status to the future landscape.

Guiding principles for executive education

In response to its charge, the working group offered the following suggestions for guiding principles for the development of executive education at Berkeley.

Overarching principles

- UC Berkeley's effort in, and academic reputation for, undergraduate and graduate education, along with its research enterprise, must be protected while growing the market for executive education.
- The total value, both reputational and economic, created for Berkeley as a whole from executive education programming should be maximized.

Principles relating to programs, format, and quality

- UC Berkeley should offer first-rate programs with appropriate academic oversight that reflect the content expertise of Berkeley and the offering units.
- Programs should address real-world topics and challenges, thereby leading to measurable positive change for our clients.
- Berkeley should develop and deliver a first-class executive education learning experience to clients.
- Berkeley's executive education programs should engage fellow participants to add value to participants' professional networks.
- Berkeley's executive education programs should be customer-focused—always considering what is in the best interest of clients.

Principles relating to structure, and governance

- Berkeley should aim to provide a "One Berkeley" integrated solution that provides prospective clients seamless access to all executive education that the University offers, regardless of which portal the client initially enters.
- Berkeley should provide a consistent, high-quality experience for prospects and clients with minimal hand-offs or exposure to the University's internal structures.
- There should be coordination across campus offerings, to minimize overlaps and ensure that there are not gaps that could usefully be filled by academic units.
- There should be close internal collaboration; we intend not to compete with each other, and higher quality programs can be delivered by leveraging the most appropriate faculty and instructors, even if they are in a different unit, while respecting other demands on their time.
- Opportunities to allow all academic units to offer executive education should be created.
- No state funds should be used to support executive education.
- Opportunities to teach in executive education programs should be used to recruit and retain faculty who have relevant expertise and aptitude.

Scale of future opportunity

Due to overlapping classifications between executive and continuing education, there is no clear estimate of the market size for executive education. In 2011, the International University Consortium for Executive Education (UNICON) projected the international executive education market to be $2 billion.[1]
The market is fragmented with numerous providers from both university and professional service firms. *The Economist Executive Education Navigator*[2], an online directory of business executive education, lists 195 global providers comprised mostly of university-based business school programs. A survey of 70 buyers of corporate education conducted on behalf of UNICON in 2015 described custom executive education as the fastest growing segment in this field, a segment that is attracting more non-university, professional service firms into the market-place.[3]

A number of UC Berkeley professional schools serve both domestic and foreign clients on-campus and abroad. While global clients inquire about bringing instructors from Berkeley to their country, it is costly to bring faculty for an extended length of time to an international client; consequently, the overall market is limited by the higher costs. The Goldman School of Public Policy reported that their government clients prefer to come to Berkeley.

The working group noted with caution that there may be additional revenue worth pursuing in executive education but the financial goal is to create net operating surplus, not simply to create self-sustaining executive education programs that could detract from our core academic mission.

Constraints

The following constraints were discussed as having the potential to limit the growth of Berkeley's executive education programs:

The lack of **premium housing** for participants. Most providers currently work with perimeter hotels. Executive education participants have recently begun staying in Airbnb units and foregoing conference hotels. In general, it has been found impractical, and sometimes financially risky, for academic units to organize hotel reservations for clients.

The lack of available **premium classroom space** appropriate for the expectations of the desired clientele (and the executive education premium price tag) was identified as a significant constraint on future growth. Providers currently use Haas, California Memorial Stadium, the Brower Center, Sutardja Dai Hall, and Easton Hall (CDSP). The availability of classroom space is particularly challenging in the face of steadily increasing numbers of matriculated Berkeley students, particularly undergraduates and professional students.

While locating executive education in off-campus spaces might address the local shortage of high-quality instructional space, participants agreed that many executive education participants prefer a campus location when selecting UC Berkeley as their executive education provider. Furthermore, the group recognized that Berkeley's academic prestige is less of a magnet to prospective participants when instruction is off-campus.

The amount of **time to hire sales personnel** through the University's hiring channels was cited as an impediment to growth. For example, when a salesperson leaves the University, it may take three- to six-months to find, hire, and train a new person, which is detrimental to relationship sales.

---

[1] *University-Based Executive Education Markets and Trends*. Frank R. Lloyd and David Newkirk. August 15, 2011. International University Consortium for Executive Education (UNICON). www.uniconexed.org.

[2] EconEx.ec/Navigator

[3] *Future Trends in Business Education*, a market trends survey project by Executive Core, LLC, on behalf of The Association to advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Executive MBA Council (EMBAC), and the Executive Education Consortium (UNICOM). 2015.

The time it takes to get **business contracts** approved, particularly international contracts, challenges growth. Executive education units need to move more quickly (i.e., in pace with their corporate clients, and more experienced peer universities) to take full advantage of opportunities. GSPP cited specific instances where contract opportunities were lost due to the University's inability to respond to business contract issues in a more timely fashion.

Though teaching in executive education programs is usually considered consulting and not a part of a faculty member's regular responsibilities, it is still worth noting that **faculty time** is a scarce resource in most campus units. In addition, lack of faculty availability, expertise, and interest in creating new programs or content, or their limited experience with teaching a corporate (or "practitioner") audience can hinder growth of offerings. The interest and willingness to develop content might be addressed by increasing faculty compensation for program development, but doing so may be limited by the economics of a program. Such economics vary across schools and different client markets. To increase faculty participation across units, it may be useful for units to offer workshops for faculty to assist in guiding content creation for corporate/practitioner audiences.

Internal competition is an undeniable constraint on effective positioning and growth of Berkeley's executive education programs. Getting clarity on our intent not to compete becomes most important in cases, hopefully rare, where different units at Berkeley are offering the same content to the same client type. In these instances, web-based—i.e. available-to-the-world—and other forms of marketing to potential clients can create confusion about which part of the University is offering the program. Moreover, similar programs, especially open enrollment programs, involve duplication of resources and overhead.

An additional constraint is the limited number of Berkeley faculty who have both the subject matter expertise and **instructional skills for teaching *executives***, who are a very different audience from Berkeley's undergraduate and graduate students. Compounding this challenge when content and client are the same or similar, a third dimension comes into play—the source of the faculty. If units compete with one another on the same content with the same client types and make use of the same faculty, even greater confusion can arise. For example, a faculty member who has a strong relationship with a specific client could negotiate with more than one campus unit over which unit will offer a given program, undermining the total value to the University.

Overlap

The working group discussed conflicting and competing programs vis-à-vis the stated principle to not compete internally. Conflict can occur when the content, faculty, or client audiences overlap.

In general, providers felt that the distinct disciplines of Berkeley's professional schools minimize internal competition for many audiences. For example, two programs from two different graduate schools should be free to contact the same client organization when offering distinctly different programs.

Further, the specific sales contact within a client organization may be the same person (e.g., a Chief Learning Officer), but if that person is purchasing executive education on behalf of different audiences within their organization, that is acceptable.

Berkeley Executive Education (Haas) and UC Berkeley Extension's Corporate Practice both offer professional and management training to business clients. In practice, definitions of "middle-management" are inconsistent across different industries and companies, and BEE and UNEX bump up against each other in the marketplace as they offer similar programs, often taught by the same faculty, to the same organizations. The deans of these two organizations have recognized this conflict and have agreed to address it outside of the recommendations of this working group.

Similarly, while many professional schools are marketing to their respective professions, several offer similar programs such as innovation, strategy, or other concepts that apply across industries and sectors. In theory, this should not be a problem if there is enough distinction for a client to find the best program fit for their organization. The threat, however, is to the overall value to the University if a client finds similar programs and makes a selection decision purely on lowest-price.

The working group discussed whether to endorse a statement that those offering executive education at UC Berkeley intend not to compete internally. Most participants preferred a positive comment about collaboration which may serve the same purpose in a positive affirmation. Other members stated that even with the best of intentions, there will always be tricky situations that arise and constant communication will be needed to avoid market-confusion.

The group noted that the topic of who "owns" a prospective client relationship is similar to conversations that University Development and Alumni Relations has had over the years regarding which campus units "own" prospective donors. The preferred approach was not to impose and monitor restrictions but to collaborate and communicate. However, it was agreed that there may be benefit in the future from the approach used by UDAR of identifying a primary relationship manager to prospective donors. This approach could ensure that individual clients or organizations perceive Berkeley as serving their needs well.

Governance Structure

Because the working group could not reach consensus on a statement that those offering executive education at UC Berkeley intend not to compete internally, it could not fully address its charge. However, it reached agreement on a way forward that would address some of the existing constraints, while building trust to the level needed for higher level decision-making, and investment in building the necessary infrastructure.

It was agreed that a council of executive education providers should be established. This group should meet quarterly (at least) to discuss opportunities for collaboration and to resolve any marketing channel conflicts. This group should report annually to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost on activities, revenues, costs, etc. to provide clarity on the overall campus landscape in executive education. This information will provide the necessary background for evaluating the costs and potential benefits of future investments to increase the campus activity in executive education. Recommendations for resources, staffing, or tools to expand executive education would be made by this council and proposed to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for a final decision as part of the annual budget cycle.

The consortium of smaller professional schools discussed above (Partnership Example 6) might be formally recognized as a subcommittee of this council; this could be extremely beneficial in establishing a more systematic campus approach to organizing executive education.

The working group believes that several additional measures may be constructively considered by this group in the medium- to long-term, depending upon its efficacy and the "pain points" that are identified. These are discussed below.

Next Steps and Recommendations

Overall
Undertaking executive education requires agility, responsiveness, and entrepreneurship. Campus oversight should, of course, recognize the need to deliver a Berkeley quality product and to do more than just cover the costs of executive education. However, oversight should be done deftly by always balancing the costs of new regulations or reviews against the possibility that they will reduce the ability to be agile, responsive, and entrepreneurial.

Immediate-term
The working group believes that a council of executive education providers should be convened as soon as possible, to continue the momentum started by the working group.

Medium-term
In a similar vein of creating a client-centered approach to executive education, the campus should work toward developing a unified Berkeley brand for its offerings. It would be immensely productive to have a single web portal with brief descriptions of all programs that is searchable and filterable, and appropriate links.

The working group recognized that there is no single, customer relationship system in use across the campus. A single Customer Relationship Management software system could greatly improve our efficacy in developing the market. However, the working group also agreed that such a system would require a commitment to updating all information in an open way, which in turn requires complete trust on the part of all executive education providers.

Long-term
As Berkeley builds visibility and capacity in executive education, it would be appropriate to develop an executive education facility on campus, ideally with overnight lodging. Absent this, our capacity will be necessarily constrained. Such an investment might be funded by a donor, or approached as a public-private partnership. However, significant work is needed before this step would be appropriate to explore.

Recommendations

Recommendation: Form a standing council of executive education providers to meet quarterly to develop market opportunities, address any channel conflicts, and report annually to the EVCP.

The working group does not feel that definition and delineation of market channels would be effective in a fast-paced, evolving marketplace. Rather, there is appetite for consultation and collaboration. The standing council will provide a structure in which market opportunities are discussed regularly, with opportunity to address channel conflicts promptly.

Recommendation: Investigate the UDAR model of assigning prospects and donors to relationship managers for possible adoption for executive education client prospecting.

UDAR has developed a model of assigning a relationship manager to prospective donors. This model is worth exploring to determine whether it can be applied to the market for executive education. It is not intended to prohibit solicitation of any individual client or organization, but to clarify which campus units have had previous contact. The Global Engagement Office was also mentioned as a model for coordinating communication.

Recommendation: Work toward a unified brand image for Berkeley's executive education offerings.

It will serve our prospective clients to develop a unified umbrella brand that will help clients find the program that is the best fit for their needs. One manifestation of this branding would be a single web portal with brief descriptions for all programs with links to local websites for more information.

Recommendation: Explore the feasibility of acquiring and deploying a Customer Relationship Management software solution.

The Working Group recognized that no single, customer relationship system is in use right now and that, under the right conditions, a single system could be effective in developing the market. However, there are two strong caveats. First, CRM systems are successful when everyone involved commits to updating them, which may be difficult in a federated-model. Second, while there was a willingness among members to discuss which clients they work with, there was reluctance to reveal which *prospective* clients are in development. The group felt that this could work for organizations but not individual prospects.

Recommendation: The working group does not recommend assigning specific entitlements to campus executive education providers.

By relying on precise definitions, entitlements can limit opportunity in an evolving marketplace. Providers should commit to communicating and collaborating to avoid market conflict and minimize confusion. Implementation of a relationship manager model could help to ensure improved communication and collaboration.

Long-term Recommendation: Explore donor or private-party interest to develop an executive education facility on campus, ideally with overnight lodging.

Even if such a donor or private partner was located today, this solution would still take years. However, there is a strong desire for prospective clients to be immersed in the Berkeley campus environment and, without new classroom or lodging solutions, there will be a limit to the University's ability to develop this market.

Appendix A: Charge letter to the working group

Berkeley
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Paul Alivisatos
Executive Vice Chancellor
& Provost

200 California Hall #1500
Berkeley, CA 94720
510 642-1961 phone
510 642-5499 fax
paul.alivisatos@berkeley.edu
evcp.berkeley.edu

July 31, 2017
Updated

Fiona Doyle, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Dean, Graduate Division (Chair)
Stefano Bertozzi, Dean, School of Public Health
Henry Brady, Dean, Goldman School of Public Policy
Prudence Carter, Dean, Graduate School of Education
Robert David, Director Corporate & Professional Programs, University Extension
Lee Fleming, Faculty Director, Coleman Fung Institute for Engineering Leadership
Barbara Lane, Assistant Dean of Administration, College of Natural Resources
Rich Lyons, Dean, Haas School of Business
Michael Rielly, Chief Executive Officer, Berkeley Executive Education
Sudha Shetty, Assistant Dean for International Partnerships, GSPP
Anthony St George, Assistant Dean, Corporate and International Relations, College of Engineering
Diana Wu, Dean, University Extension, Berkeley Resource Center for Online Education (BRCOE), New Academic Ventures at Berkeley (NAV-B)

RE: Executive Education Working Group

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Executive Education Working Group. As discussed in the Council of Deans recently, there is tremendous opportunity for Berkeley to expand access to our educational programs by increasing our executive education footprint. In order to ensure the programmatic and financial success of all executive education programs offered by the campus – both currently and in the future - we need effective coordination and collaboration. With clear and agreed-upon guidelines and supportive infrastructure, we can avoid unnecessary confusion for clients and providers as well as problematic competition between units.

In recognition of the importance of this campus-wide effort, we are charging this working group with the following deliverables:

1. Identify and map all executive education offerings and their primary attributes (e.g. educational content; audiences; fee structures; cost-sharing; etc).
2. Determine the scale of the opportunity for executive education at Berkeley and what we can do to "grow the pie".
3. Develop shared definitions for 'executive education' and associated terms.
4. Develop executive education guiding principles to recommend for campus-wide adoption.
5. Develop recommendations in the form of proposed processes, tools, infrastructure, etc. to address the following areas:

a. Competition between campus providers – for instructors, students, and clients

b. Relationship management of corporate, non-profit, and governmental entities

c. Entitlements to specific fields of study (e.g., business or journalism) and/or audiences (e.g., teachers or health care providers) for both open enrollment programs and custom offerings

d. Marketing and branding of programs, and incentives that will promote cooperative development of expanded outreach

e. Financial incentives and taxes for programs including possible financing of new programs. (Office of the CFO should be consulted for this deliverable.)

f. Maintaining and sharing critical executive education data (e.g., business contracts)

6. Recommend a governance structure that can be implemented in Spring 2018 to carry out the approved recommendations from the working group to support new and ongoing executive education efforts.

Bill Reichle, Director of New Revenue Initiatives, will provide staff support to the committee. Vice Provost Doyle's office will be in contact soon to schedule the kick-off meeting which will take place in August and be followed by regular meetings to be determined in consultation with the working group. Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Alivisatos will plan to attend the kickoff meeting to help set the vision and intention for the work group.

We ask that you submit a set of recommendations by December 1, 2017 for the review and determination of next steps by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. We look forward to receiving your thoughtful advice on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Carol T. Christ

Carol Christ
Chancellor

Paul Alivisatos
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

CC: Khira Griscavage, Associate Chancellor
Phyllis Hoffman, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor
Andrea Lambert, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the EVCP
Rosemarie Rae, Vice Chancellor – Finance & Chief Financial Officer
Bill Reichle, Director, New Revenue Initiatives
Council of Deans

Appendix B: Working group membership

Committee Chair
Fiona Doyle, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Dean, Graduate Division

Members
Stefano Bertozzi, Dean of Public Health
Henry Brady, Dean, Goldman School of Public Policy
Prudence Carter, Dean, Graduate School of Education
Robert David, Director, Corporate & Professional Programs, University Extension
Lee Fleming, Faculty Director, Coleman Fung Institute for Engineering Leadership
Barbara Lane, Assistant Dean of Administration, College of Natural Resources
Rich Lyons, Dean, Haas School of Business
Michael Rielly, Chief Executive Officers, Berkeley Executive Education
Sudha Shetty, Assistant Dean for International Partnerships, Goldman School of Public Policy
Anthony St. George, Assistant Dean, Corporate and International Relation, College of Engineering
Diana Wu, Dean, University Extension, Berkeley Resource Center for Online Education (BRCOE), New Academic Ventures at Berkeley (NAV-B)

Staff
Bill Reichle, Director, New Revenue Initiatives

Appendix C: Executive Education at Stanford

Executive Education Programs at Stanford

Stanford offers a variety of corporate, professional, and continuing education programs, primarily organized around its professional schools. Below are descriptions found online at Stanford.edu. Revenue for executive and continuing education at Stanford was grouped with other auxiliary revenues in the university's annual report.

Stanford Graduate School of Business
Executive Education
Stanford's Business School offers courses for individuals and organizations in governance, management, innovation, marketing, organization leadership, personal leadership, and supply chain.

Stanford Medicine
Stanford Center for Continuing Medical Education
The Stanford Continuing Medical Education Program includes a broad range of primary care, specialty, and subspecialty topics serving physicians and other health-professionals in both medicine, and teaching and research.

Stanford Law School
Executive Education
Stanford Law School offers Legal Executive Education with an emphasis on law's intersection with business, policy, and conflict resolution. Programs include a Director's College for senior executives at publicly traded firms, a Director's consortium, a Director's College for Venture-Backed Company Directors, and international programs.

Stanford Design School
Executive Education
The Stanford Design School offers four programs for executives: Design Thinking Bootcamp, Customer-Focused Innovation (in partnership with the Stanford Graduate School of Business), a 3-hour Innovation Workshop, and Innovation at Work online.

Stanford Center for Professional Development
The Stanford Center for Professional Development, a part of the Office of the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning, is geared for professionals to take courses and programs in-person and online while maintaining their careers.

Stanford Online
As part of their Continuing Education Program, Stanford Online offers a variety of professional education opportunities in conjunction with many of the University's schools and departments. Free online courses are offered by faculty.

Stanford Continuing Studies
A part of Stanford's Continuing Education Program, Continuing Studies offers approximately 550 courses per year, attracting more than 16, 000 students in liberal arts and sciences, creative writing, and professional and personal development.

Appendix D: Executive Education at Harvard

Executive Education at Harvard

Harvard offers a variety of corporate, professional, and continuing education programs. Below are descriptions found online at Harvard.edu. Harvard's annual report listed revenue of $410M for Continuing Education and Executive Programs for fiscal year 2017.

Harvard Business School
HBS offers a variety of open enrollment and custom programs and is considered the most successful executive education provider in the field.

Harvard Professional Development
The Harvard Extension Program offers non-credit programs on the Harvard campus open to managers and small business owners.

Harvard Law School
Harvard's Law School offers open-enrollment and custom programs to help law firm and corporate counsel leaders develop skills and strategies for leading in the legal profession. Harvard Law also offers programs in negotiation, mediation, and conflict management skills.

Harvard Kennedy School of Government
The Harvard Kennedy School offers programs that strengthen the capabilities of global leaders on adding public value and solving complex challenges.

Harvard Graduate School of Education
The Harvard Education School provides online and on-campus programs designed to make a direct impact on the practice of education professionals, the work of schools and institutions, and the learning of students.

Harvard Medical School
Harvard's Medical School focuses on developing strategies for optimizing patient care, including on-campus and online learning opportunities for physicians and healthcare professionals.

Harvard School of Dental Medicine
Harvard Dental School offers scientifically- and clinically-relevant continuing education courses for dental professionals.

Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health
The Harvard School of Public Health provides courses for healthcare leaders to expand their skills and understanding.

Harvard Graduate School of Design
The Harvard School of Design offers programs spanning design, architecture, real estate, technology, finance, planning, leadership, and economic development.

Harvard Extension School
Harvard University offers a wide variety of open-enrollment courses in more than 60 topic areas, in the evening or online. This is part of Harvard's Continuing Education offerings.