

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION
(CAPRA)**

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

2:30 – 4:00 pm

KL 362

Documents found at [UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources](https://ucmcrops.org/capra1314/resources)

AGENDA

I. Chair’s Report – Anne Kelley

A. Updates from October 22 DivCo Meeting – *Jan Wallander*

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the agenda

B. Approval of the October 15 meeting minutes **Pg. 3**

III. Conflict of Interest Policy **Pg. 7**

Background. In AY 12-13, CRE and DivCo suggested that each Senate standing committee adopt a conflict of interest policy based on those at UC Riverside. At the October 15 CAPRA meeting, the committee reviewed the UC Riverside Committee on Planning & Budget’s conflict of interest statement and decided it was not relatable to UC Merced. The CAPRA analyst researched the conflict of interest statements at other campus Senates and received policies from Berkeley, Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. Note: most campuses have a recusal policy rather than a conflict of interest statement.

Action requested: Review the conflict of interest statements and recusal policies from other Planning & Budget committees at UC campuses.

IV. FTE Requests

A. Draft 2 of proposed process and criteria for FTE requests **Pg. 18**

B. Feedback received from School Executive Committees **Pg. 20**

Background. On October 16, Chair Kelley asked the School Executive Committees for feedback on the FTE requests process.

Action requested: Review draft 2 of the proposed process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests. Review feedback solicited from School Executive Committees

on last year's FTE request process. These comments will be compiled for Division Council for discussion at the joint DivCo/CAPRA meeting with the Provost on November 7.

V. Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
October 15, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 2:30 pm on October 15, 2013 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley debriefed the committee on the following:

-- October 1 meeting of the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB). Patrick Lenz, Vice President of Budget and Capital Resources, spoke about the budget process, funding models, and capital outlay. There was a discussion about the campuses transitioning to a new funding model. It was repeatedly pointed out at UCPB that UC Merced is often the exception to the implementation of new models due to the campus's unique nature: while other campuses need funds for renovation of existing buildings (seismic retrofitting, etc.) UC Merced needs new buildings at a rapid pace. UCPB also held a discussion on enrollment management and rebenching. In order to make rebenching palatable to the campuses, rebenching would only increase the amount of money that poorly-funded campuses are receiving. The affluent campuses will not receive less money. There was also a lengthy discussion on the new UC health care plans. The UC is discontinuing a few health plans and adding UC CARE which is managed by the UC. While this is more of a Faculty Welfare issue, UCPB is concerned with the financial solvency of the UC with these new health plans.

ACTION: CAPRA analyst will email the committee the information from HR on the informational sessions and Town Halls on the new health plans as well as the At Your Service web link to compare the new plans.

--DivCo meeting on October 8. CAPRA member Wallander provided a brief update to CAPRA members. DivCo would like to hold a joint meeting with CAPRA and Provost Peterson to discuss the FTE process last year and the process for AY 13-14. CAPRA intends to consult with a broad range of constituencies across campus to obtain feedback about the FTE process.

--Strategic Focusing Initiative meetings and town halls.

Chair Kelley attended the first town hall on October 4. Discussion centered around a [memo](#) that was sent on September 26 to all faculty, from the Senate office on behalf of Provost Peterson, on the list of [guiding questions](#) that the Provost requested be considered when Bylaw 55 units, research units, or other groups of faculty submit strategic plans. Some details are still unclear but new information is continually forthcoming from the Provost's office. CAPRA must address the question of how the strategic focusing process/Project 2020 will dovetail with the CAPRA FTE request process this year.

ACTION: CAPRA analyst will email the committee the list of faculty and administrators on the Strategic Focusing Working Group.

II. Consent Calendar

Today's agenda was approved as presented. (The September 17 meeting minutes were previously approved via email.)

III. Conflict of Interest Statement

CRE Chair Rick Dale suggested to DivCo that Senate standing committees adopt conflict of interest statements similar to those at UC Riverside's Senate committees. Prior to this meeting, the UC Riverside CAPRA equivalent's conflict of interest statement was distributed to the committee for review. This issue will become significant in the spring semester when CAPRA is voting on FTE requests. The committee discussed the possibility of all CAPRA members discussing all FTE requests but recusing from voting on their own programs, but also saw disadvantages to this approach as well as difficulties in defining the "programs" to which each member belongs. It was concluded that UCR's COI policy may not be the best model for Merced. Members pointed out that they are here to represent the faculty and should not bring individual agendas to the table. Transparency and flexibility are important.

ACTION: CAPRA analyst will research UC Davis's conflict of interest statement as Davis's structure contains some similarities to UC Merced's. This item will be tabled until the next meeting.

IV. FTE Request Process

Prior to this meeting, Chair Kelley distributed a draft policy she created based on the last two years of CAPRA requests. One goal is to reduce the amount of paperwork that faculty and units must complete. CAPRA must decide whether to request FTEs from graduate groups or Bylaw 55 units as this was one of the main controversies last year. While it would be desirable for CAPRA to allow the faculty and units to use the same information they submit to the Provost for the strategic focusing initiative, the Provost and CAPRA timelines may not run in parallel.

Other issues that CAPRA must decide in its evaluation criteria are: whether to require the Dean and the submitting program to provide their rankings, how to handle failed searches and replacement FTEs, and how to judge requests from graduate programs that span more than one School. The committee agreed that replacement FTEs should be returned to the unit and generally, failed searches should be allowed to be repeated. However, the Provost has the authority over both issues. The committee agreed that CAPRA should request FTE rankings from both the Dean and the submitting program (not the School as a whole). CAPRA should include in its request language that explicitly states how the committee will handle FTE requests that come from more than one School (e.g. requiring justification for the FTEs from both School Deans). This will provide guidance and transparency.

CAPRA members also discussed DivCo's request from the latter's October 8 meeting that CAPRA should generate a list of items that went wrong during last year's FTE request process and present them to DivCo with the goal that this list will provide the foundation for future FTE discussions with the Provost. CAPRA members agreed that wider input is needed from the School Executive Committee chairs and the School Deans on this issue.

ACTION: CAPRA Chair Kelley will contact the School Executive Committee chairs and the School Deans to obtain their feedback on last year's FTE request challenges. Comments received from both groups –as well as from CAPRA – will be transmitted to DivCo.

V. Systemwide Review Item – final review of APM 600

Chair Kelley provided an overview of the review item to committee members. APM 600 was formally reviewed by the ten campuses and UCOP last spring. This item is tangentially related to CAPRA as it contains information on compensation for summer teaching. Committee members agreed that since the first review has already taken place and that CAPRA is not the lead reviewer, the committee will decline to comment.

ACTION: CAPRA analyst will transmit a memo to Senate Chair López-Calvo stating that CAPRA declines to comment on this review item.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

**Conflict of Interest Policy: Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Adopted February 14, 2007**

In a university, the term “conflict of interest” refers to financial or other personal considerations that may compromise, or appear to compromise, a faculty member’s professional judgment in administration, management, instruction, research, or other professional activities. Committee members should always keep this potential in mind and take appropriate action when a conflict of interest arises. Conflicts may arise because the committee member is in the same unit (Department, Institute, School, or academic group at a comparable level) or may have had personal and/or professional relationships with one or more parties or units concerned in the committee’s deliberations. Bearing in mind that the most informed committee discussions are the most useful, possible actions include simply informing the chair or the chair and committee members, absenting oneself from parts of a discussion and/or from voting, and full recusal.

There are additional circumstances in which abstention from voting, or absence from part of a meeting or deliberation, or even total recusal may be necessary. The need for recusal, or actions short of recusal, may arise from the nature of the committee’s areas of jurisdiction, or from the circumstances of a particular individual, case, or from a problem dealt with in the course of the committee’s work. A committee member should consult with the committee Chair about the proper course of action if in doubt. The decision to recuse oneself, however, need not be accompanied by any explanation.

It should be kept in mind that an individual with a conflict or apparent conflict may have knowledge about the issue under consideration, and that it is important not to deprive the committee or other body of that expertise. Accordingly, the minimum level of recusal consistent with avoiding conflicts or apparent conflicts is preferred. Even in cases of the most severe conflicts, it may still be appropriate for an individual to present to the committee his or her knowledge and opinions about the subject under consideration before withdrawing from further participation. It should also be noted that representing and/or belonging to a body (e.g., a Department) is not usually a conflict per se.

Committee members should consider recusal or other action in the following circumstances:

- 1) The Committee member has, or has had, a family relationship with an individual concerned in its deliberations, such as that of a current or former significant other, partner, or spouse, or child, sibling, or parent.
- 2) The Committee member has, or has had, a sexual/romantic relationship with the individual(s) concerned.
- 3) The Committee member has a personal interest, financial or otherwise, in the matter under deliberation.
- 4) The Committee member is aware of any prejudice, pro or contra, which would impair his or her judgment in the matter under discussion. [NB: open and honest intellectual disagreement is not cause for recusal.]
- 5) The Committee member believes that his or her recusal is necessary to preserve the integrity of the committee’s deliberations.
- 6) The Committee member serving as representative of the Senate on a non-Senate committee judges that his or her presence or actions may be at odds with his or her responsibilities as a Senate member.
- 7) When CAPRA is reviewing a report, proposal, project, or any other matter before the Committee which involves a Department (or a School or College consisting of a single Department), any member of that Department who is serving on CAPRA may contribute factual information about the item during the initial phases of discussion of the item, but should recuse him or herself and leave the meeting room for the remainder of the deliberations and the vote on the item.

**ACADEMIC SENATE
RECUSAL POLICY***

In the university, the term “conflict of interest” refers to financial or other personal considerations that may compromise a faculty member’s professional judgment in administration, management, instruction, research, or other professional activities. Conflicts of interest have the potential to bias, directly or indirectly, important aspects of the councils’ work, including their recommendations about academic personnel decisions, proposals for degree programs and academic units, budgetary and planning decisions, faculty grants programs, and other areas of shared governance. Senate council/committee members must always keep potential conflicts in mind and recuse themselves where a conflict of interest arises.

Recusal Policy

(A) Senate council/committee members must recuse themselves in the following circumstances:

1. The Senate council/committee member has, or has had, a family relationship with the applicant, such as that of a current or former significant other, partner, or spouse, or child, sibling, or parent.
2. The Senate council/committee member has a personal financial interest in the outcome of the action item.
3. The Senate council/committee member believes that his or her recusal is necessary to preserve the integrity of the review process.

(B) Upon joining the Senate council or committee, each member will be informed of this recusal policy and will be expected to abide by it.

Comment

In carrying out their work, Senate council/committee members are expected to rely on their academic expertise, experience, and judgment, and so professional agreements or differences of opinion are not by themselves a basis for recusal.

Grey Areas

In “grey areas” where a Senate council/committee member is uncertain regarding recusal, he or she may disclose the potential grounds for recusal to the Senate council or committee Chair. The Chair may then determine whether the member should recuse himself or herself, or the Chair may seek the advice of other council/committee members in making this determination. The Chair or members may suggest that a member abstain from voting when a conflict of interest exists. The Chair should consult the whole council/committee regarding potential grounds for his or her own recusal. In making its determination regarding recusal in grey areas, the council/committee will take into account the fact that, by design, each member brings valuable and unique expertise to the council/committee as a whole.

**Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised* guides all Senate meetings.

Approved by the Senate Cabinet: May 19, 2009

October 9, 2013

Expected Commitment for 2013-14 CPB Members

This is to discuss the expectations of members of the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB).

The Senate expects that we will meet regularly to conduct Senate business and examine long-range academic planning issues. CPB members may make special arrangements with the CPB Chair to reduce their participation in meetings for part of their appointment period due to extenuating circumstances such as a sabbatical leave of absence.

Four specific expectations of CPB members are listed below:

1. Plan to attend a minimum of 75% of scheduled CPB meetings and be prepared for all meeting discussions.
2. Keep confidential all materials and discussions related to the Academic Planning Group (APG) business. CPB may have access to confidential information provided by the Administration that is generated by or presented to either the APG or the Budget Working Group (BWG). Each of these groups is appointed by Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Gillman and consists of members of the Faculty and the Administration. Some of this information may be particularly sensitive, for example discussions of performance of departments or potential administration actions affecting resources available to the units. These materials should not be discussed with anyone, including your chair, faculty colleagues, school administrators, etc.
3. In carrying out the work of CPB, put aside preferences based solely on unit affiliation or personal gain; review and recommend from a campuswide perspective.
4. Conduct deliberations with due regard for potential conflicts of interest, and adhere to Senate policy regarding recusing oneself from participating in consideration of issues when the appearance of a conflict of interests exists.

Please consider these points and the CPB meeting schedule. If for any reason this is a larger commitment that you can make for the year, arrangements can be made for a replacement for the remainder of your term.

Thank you for your participation on the Council on Planning and Budget.



Abel Klein, Chair
Council on Planning & Budget

GUIDELINES FOR SENATE COUNCIL/COMMITTEE CHAIRS
Notes from the Divisional Chair and Executive Director

Thank you for agreeing to Chair a Senate Committee in 2013-2014.

These guidelines are designed to offer information about the resources available to you as a UCSB Academic Senate Council/Committee Chair. The Guidelines also define the role of the Senate staff who work directly with your Council/Committee, clarify what is and is not possible for you in your role as Chair, and explain how the lines of communication and information flow in and out of the Academic Senate Office.

Divisional Chair (Kum-Kum Bhavnani, 2012-2014)

The senior officer of the Senate is the Divisional Chair. This is a two-year elected position. The Divisional Chair may or may not have previously served as the Vice Chair; the Vice Chair does not automatically succeed to the position of Chair. The Divisional Chair is the voice of the Divisional Senate, and her/his communications with the Chancellor, with the systemwide Senate, and with the press, explain the Senate's position on issues under discussion. For the Chair to do her/his job most effectively, we ask all Senate Council and Committee Chairs to ensure the Divisional Chair is fully informed on all matters pertaining to the activities of your Council/Committee, and, when appropriate, on other matters relating to Senate activities.

The contact information for the Senate Chair is: kum-kum.bhavani@senate.ucsb.edu

Executive Director (Deborah Karoff)

The Executive Director supports the Senate Chair and is the chief administrative officer of the Senate and the chief policy consultant for the Faculty Legislature, for the Executive Council and for all standing councils and committees. The Executive Director is also responsible for the management of the Senate office including supervising the analysts and other staff who support the work of the Senate Councils and Committees. Chairs who believe that their Council/Committee is not adequately supported should raise the matter with the Executive Director. Chairs may also discuss such matters informally with the Divisional Chair. Please direct all requests for expenditures and reimbursements to the Executive Director. Senate policy is that such expenditures should be approved in writing prior to incurring the expense.

Contact information for the Executive Director is: deborah.karoff@senate.ucsb.edu

Role of the Council/Committee Analyst/Advisor

The primary function of the Analyst/Advisor is to provide expertise and support to the Council/Committee so the group can perform the work as described in the Senate Bylaws. Typically, Analysts provide pertinent information related to council/committee issues, suggest agenda items; draft agendas; recommend, contact and schedule consultants; provide minutes of the meetings; follow up on action items; draft committee recommendations and statements for the Executive Council, Faculty Legislature, or Divisional Chair; help draft the annual report, and advise on the proper vetting of proposals according to established policies and procedures. At times, the Analyst is expected to work with the Chair and Council/Committee members to produce reports or articles on issues that are deemed to be of interest to the general faculty. It is the responsibility of the Council/Committee Chair to copy the Analyst on all committee related communications and to cooperate with her or him on the timely preparation of the agenda and on the follow-up of action items. Council/Committee Chairs work very closely with Senate Analysts/Advisors

and we have found that they develop a mutual respect, which is critical for this working relationship.

Role of Representatives, *Ex officio* Members and Consultants

The number and area of non-Senate representatives (e.g. Unit 18, Researchers, etc.), student representatives and *ex officio* members are specified in the Bylaw of each council and committee. The primary role of representatives is to provide the perspective of their respective constituents and to serve as a liaison between their constituents and the Council/Committee. Representatives and *ex officio* members do not vote, but they may voice their opinions on issues and have their opinions recorded separately.

Student Representatives must be formally appointed to Councils/Committees, as stated in the Bylaws. Records of student representation are kept in the Senate office. Student Representatives may designate an official alternate to attend meetings. However, they may not switch arbitrarily or bring additional student representatives to any meetings. Some Bylaws specify that additional student representatives may be appointed to a Council's standing committees. Standing Committee representatives do not sit in on Council meetings. It is the responsibility of the appointed Student Representative to ensure a clear and up-to-date flow of information between the Council/Committee and their relevant constituencies, including the respective student organization from which they are drawn.

Consultants, usually administrators and staff, attend portions of Council/Committee meetings by invitation only. They provide a vital role in providing timely information to the Councils and Committee. Chairs should feel no obligation to have consultants attend all meetings or to sit in on the entire meeting to which they have been invited. Generally, such consultation is limited to a particular agenda item and the time it takes to accomplish it during the meeting. Chairs should feel free to schedule "executive sessions"—voting members only—at any time.

There are some issues that involve sensitive or confidential information and it is important to remind Council and Committee members about the need to use appropriate discretion. It is useful for Chairs to remind members about honoring confidentiality as needed. A general rule is that a sensitive matter that is discussed during a meeting is not discussed outside the meeting, with non-members. This is a situation whereby using executive session time can be helpful. If students or consultants are present, they should not be included in such a discussion. Recusal of members is discussed, below.

Discussion of Issues and Communicating with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Department Chairs

Most of the documents to be discussed by your Council/Committee are distributed to the Councils/Committees for advice and comment. These come from the Divisional Chair and are circulated by the Executive Director. The routing system in the Senate Office is such that all incoming business is addressed either to the Divisional Chair and/or the Executive Council. The documents are entered into a Senate tracking system and then routed to the pertinent Council or Committee Analyst; documents relating directly to a specific topic will be addressed directly to the Council or Committee Chair. Please make sure that all correspondence to the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Deans and Department Chairs on matters of policy, or stating final action for the Division, are copied to the Divisional Chair and the Executive Director. In most cases, such correspondence will be routed through the Divisional Chair before being distributed.

Council/Committee Meeting Dates

Each Council and Senate standing committee has an established meeting time (e.g., every other Monday at 1:30 p.m.). The Committee on Committees relays this meeting time to all

prospective members. Officers and members of Councils and standing committees should arrange with their departments in advance to clear their calendars for these regular meeting times.

Standing Committees of Councils meet on an *ad hoc* basis. The duties of the Council's standing committees are determined by the Bylaws. Items may be referred to a standing Committee by the Council Chair, or determined by the standing Committee Chair, as long as it is within the purview of the committee.

Retreats and Special Focus Meetings

Councils and Senate Committees may find it useful to schedule a retreat or special focus meeting. Arrangements for such meetings must be approved by the Senate Chair and Executive Director prior to being scheduled.

Creating *ad hoc* Committees

The Chairs of Councils and Senate Committees may create an external *ad hoc* committee when the following circumstances exist:

- An issue requires in-depth research and formulation of a recommendation that a standing committee cannot, for a legitimate reason, complete. (Legitimacy is determined by the Council Chair, in consultation with the Divisional Chair.)
- The discussion and formulation requires additional expertise that is not available on a council or standing committee.
- The task is specific and time limited.

Chairs may consult the Committee on Committees to determine possible members of the *ad hoc* committee. The charge to the *ad hoc* committee must be in writing, should specify the task to be completed, and indicate a date by which the decision/discussion is communicated to the council or committee that established the *ad hoc* committee. If an extension of time is required the request must be written and the response documented. The *ad hoc* committee is formally disbanded upon acceptance of its product.

Modes of Communication

The majority of interaction between Council or Committee Chair and the Analyst/Advisors will be in person or via e-mail. The usual mode of communication between the Senate office and council/committee members is via the portal: <http://senate.ucsb.edu>

The Senate uses a system called the Document Management System (DMS) to organize all of the Senate's Council/Committee work. All agendas, minutes, drafts and reports will be available to council/committee members on the specific council/committee page of the Senate website. Login is required. Members are encouraged to read the material on screen and print material as necessary. Paper copies are not provided by the Academic Senate. The Analysts/Advisors as well as Council/Committee Chairs post documents to the specific web pages for their respective council/committee and they may also use the system to e-mail all council/committee members. Chairs should strongly encourage members to read the background information for the agenda items prior to meetings so they are prepared to act during the meetings. It is the norm that agendas and related documents are posted in the week prior to the meeting date, so that members have sufficient time to acquaint themselves with the pertinent information prior to the meetings.

While some council/committee-specific work is addressed to a particular council/committee, the majority of the incoming requests and proposals will be addressed to the Divisional Chair or the Executive Council. It is not unusual for most items to be considered by more than one Council or Committee. All comments and responses are to be directed back to the

Divisional Chair, with a copy to the Executive Director, by the deadline provided. If a deadline cannot be met, an extension must be requested, via e-mail, to the Executive Director, specifying the date by which the response will be made. Exceptions to deadlines are granted when possible. The Senate Chair, with the support of the Executive Director, develops a Division response that is forwarded to the person or body that requested review.

COUNCIL/COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT

Given the high workload for Councils and Committees, it is expected that the Chair, with assistance from Senate Analyst/Advisor, will manage the workload in order to ensure timely completion of business. The Divisional Chair, via the Executive Director, will forward most items from the systemwide office for comment. Council and Committee Chairs can choose, often after informing their Council/Committee, not to comment and then relay this decision to the Executive Director via the Senate Analyst.

In order to manage the workload, we suggest the following:

- Ensure the necessary background for decision is available
- Keep discussion on track and move it along; require action/closure at end of each agenda item,
- Keep the more critical issues visible and in the forefront; use the Consent Agenda for less critical issues. Sometimes, discussion can focus on non-critical issues, with the result that there is not enough time to discuss larger and/or critical issues.
- Refer to committees or appoint ad hoc committees as necessary
- As some groups work on a consensus basis and others use voting on a regular basis, please be prepared to be flexible in this regard.
- Break ties with vote.
- Collaborate with other Councils/Committees as appropriate.
- Keep all members engaged in the work; follow-up with members who are not coming regularly, and consult with your Senate Analyst.
- If a Council/Committee member has a *perceived* conflict of interest, he or she must recuse themselves from the discussion and from the vote. If a question arises about a possible conflict of interest, it is probably perceived as such by others; therefore the member should recuse themselves from the discussion. For example, if the issue under discussion focuses on a Program Review for a particular department, and a member (or affiliated member) of that department is a member of the Council/Committee, it is the usual practice for the member to step outside the meeting until the discussion is completed. The Council/Committee Chair or the Senate analyst can provide guidance about recusals if necessary.
- Consult with Division Chair on sensitive issues and channel comments/action through the Divisional Chair (with a copy to the Executive Director).
- The job of the Senate staff is to support the work of all the Councils/Committees, so please do not hesitate to ask for assistance from Senate staff.
- The Senate Division Chair is the spokesperson for the Senate; any media inquiries should be directed to her/him.

MEETING MANAGEMENT

Some of the ways to ensure that meetings are productive:

- Plan (before the meeting) what is most important to accomplish, and let members know what will need most attention, or is of the highest priority.
- Facilitate discussion and manage the agenda; don't let others talk too much or too long; try to make sure all members are given an opportunity to speak.
- Chairs will be most effective when listening more than speaking.
- Quorum = 1 more than ½ membership unless otherwise stated in Bylaw
- If a quorum is not present, then no official action/vote is possible, although discussion is acceptable.
- While most decisions are by consensus, there may be circumstances in which a vote is required. The Council Analyst/Advisor will provide guidance and discuss with the Chair as to when a vote should occur.
- Only Senate council/committee members may vote.
- Student Representatives, Non-Senate Academic Appointment Reps (e.g. Unit 18, Researchers), Ex officio members, Consultants/Guests (typically from administrative offices) may not vote.
- Executive session (voting members only) is typically used when an item is sensitive or confidential, and discussion is best accomplished solely among those Council/Committee members who are eligible to vote.

SENATE STAFF SUPPORT

Like much of the campus, in the budget reductions from FY 2008-09, the Academic Senate Office lost 1.75 FTE, as well as funding for student support. As a result, all Senate staff added additional responsibilities to their usual assignments. In spite of these reductions, the Senate staff remain committed to serving the councils and committees with whom they work.

For this reason, Senate staff have been asked to work on streamlining the work of all committees in the following ways: shortening minutes to a list of action items, working with Chairs on the frequency of, and tasks for, sub-committee meetings; trying to use only electronic methods to perform work where possible; working with Chairs and Council to focus solely on core work and issues for that committee.

Any suggestions you may have to streamline the work of the Senate are welcome. All such suggestions will be considered especially if they help to ensure that the Academic Senate continues to be fully engaged in the critical work of shared governance both at UCSB, and systemwide.

Should you have any questions or concerns about staff support, please discuss the matter with the Executive Director.

FORTHCOMING ISSUES IN ACADEMIC SENATE-SYSTEMWIDE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

- Budget allocation method for State funding: Funding Streams, Rebenching
- Graduate Student Support
- On-line instruction
- Professional Fees/Development of Professional Programs
- Open Access Policy-Implementation
- Faculty compensation
- Non-resident Enrollment
- Issues of diversity, equity, and campus climate (campus issue also)
- Working Smarter Initiative-UC Path implementation
- Library Resources
- Leadership transitions (UC President)

ACTIVE CAMPUS ISSUES/PRIORITIES

- WASC Reaccreditation
- Decisions and Review re: Campus budget
- Graduate Student Support
- Operational Effectiveness-UC PATH, FISP Project, Email/Calendaring, etc.
- Faculty/Staff/Student Housing
- Issues of diversity, equity, and campus climate
- Open Access Implementation
- Leadership Transitions (Executive Vice-Chancellor)

September 26, 2013

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET CONSULTATION PROCEDURE

In order to allow careful consideration of issues brought before the Committee on Planning and Budget for consultation, and to assure that the Administration receives a timely and clear response, the Committee adopts the following guidelines:

1. Topics on which the Administration seeks consultation will be listed on the Committee's agenda. Deadline for agenda item submission is 2pm Thursday, previous to the week's meeting.
2. Supporting documents for scheduled consultations will be distributed with the Committee's agenda. Deadline for submission of supporting documents is 2pm Thursday, previous to the next week's meeting, unless special arrangements are made with the Senate Office to circulate the documents in advance of the meeting.
3. The Committee will endeavor to respond in writing on all topics on which it has been formally consulted within two weeks of such consultation, indicating clearly whether further discussion is required, what recommendations it is prepared to make, and what further response, if any, is expected from the Administration before the consultative process is complete.
4. Unscheduled topics may be introduced and supporting documents may be distributed at Committee meetings, but the Committee will not respond (either orally or in writing) until after it has had the opportunity for discussion at a subsequent meeting.
5. CPB's agenda will effectively close (no further submissions) two weeks before the end of the academic year to enable the Committee to finish pending business.
6. Invitations to consult with the Principal Officers are made directly with the principal officer, with a cc to the EVC.
7. Information requests are made directly to the Principal Officers with a cc to the EVC.

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal
CPEVC Galloway
Vice Chancellors
Academic Deans
Committee on Academic Personnel
Committee on Educational Policy
Graduate Council

Approved September 26, 2012 by 2013-14 Committee on Planning and Budget.

September 26, 2013

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

The CPB agrees that strict confidence will be maintained about individual personnel aspects of any matter discussed at CPB meetings. Members of the campus community presenting material to or coming before the Committee will be requested to inform the Committee when confidentiality is desired; in such cases the Minutes will note that a discussion took place without specificity concerning content. CPB recognizes the necessity of not jeopardizing sensitive negotiations while they are in progress. The Committee assumes that, after due deliberation, virtually all issues coming before CPB will become public information, usually at the time of a formal recommendation by the Committee. CPB expects members of the campus community appearing before the Committee to respect the above agreements and to refrain from identifying the individual positions taken by committee members during CPB discussions which they attend.

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal
CPEVC Alison Galloway
Vice Chancellors
Academic Deans
Committee on Academic Personnel
Committee on Educational Policy
Graduate Council
Departments
Student Union Assembly
Graduate Student Association

Approved September 26, 2013 by 2013-14 Committee on Planning and Budget.

**UC Merced CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation)
Process and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty FTE Requests for AY 2014-2015
Draft 2**

Requests for new faculty lines (FTEs) may be initiated by the Bylaw 55 units, graduate groups, research institutes, or other faculty groups. However, as appointments are made to Bylaw 55 units, a position is unlikely to be highly recommended unless it is a priority of one or more such units. Each requested position should be accompanied by a brief (1 paragraph) description of the position and a brief (1 page) justification for the position, referencing the CAPRA criteria listed below. The faculty group(s) requesting each position should be clearly identified. In addition to the specific FTE requests, each group making such requests should include a longer-term strategic plan that describes that group's planned trajectory through 2020. This may be the same document submitted to the Provost's Strategic Academic Focusing working group.

The requested positions should be ranked in priority both by the School Dean and by the faculty of each hiring unit within the School. It is expected that in SSHA and SNS, the faculty of each Bylaw 55 unit will rank those positions that might reasonably be assigned to that unit, but a single position may be ranked by more than one unit. In SOE, which is a single Bylaw 55 unit, the faculty may choose to provide separate rankings by program. Both the dean's and the faculty's rankings should be provided to CAPRA, along with a statement describing how the faculty's rankings were determined (e.g. by a vote of all faculty in the unit or by another method agreed upon by the faculty).

In addition to the FTE requests and strategic plans, CAPRA requests that each School submit (1) a table listing all faculty currently holding appointments in the School, listing their unit and graduate group affiliations and the principal undergraduate and graduate programs in which they teach; (2) a table listing all currently approved but unfilled positions; (3) a table listing expected space, startup, and other infrastructure requirements. Please see Appendices 1-3 for examples.

{Statement about cross-School position requests?}

CAPRA criteria

1. Potential to strengthen research programs in existing or nascent graduate programs/groups, including cross-school or interdisciplinary programs.
2. Support of graduate education through student mentorship and graduate teaching.
3. Ability to build connections with ORUs, CRUs, or other organized research units on campus or systemwide.
4. Support of undergraduate majors and undergraduate teaching needs.
5. Likelihood of the position as described to attract a large and diverse pool of high quality applicants.

This FTE request should include any needed LPSOE positions. It should not include carryover positions (those approved in a prior year but not yet filled) or replacements for vacated positions.

DRAFT

Feedback from School Executive Committees on FTE request process in response to CAPRA Chair Kelley's email on October 16, 2013:

Comment 1:

I would hope that the process for FTE requests this year could be somehow aligned with the Strategic Academic Focusing documents that the campus groups will be preparing (Seems to make sense to save everyone some time and energy). However, if that cannot be done, then I would request that the FTE calls are NOT solicited only from graduate groups, but also from Bylaw 55 units on campus as well. Last year there was a process to for groups to endorse other groups' FTE requests, and I thought that was a good thing.

Updated: October 23, 2013

Simrin Takhar

From: Anne Kelley
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 8:12 AM
To: Erik Menke; Marcelo Kallmann; Jeffrey Gilger; Juan Meza; Dan Hirleman; Mark Aldenderfer
Cc: Simrin Takhar
Subject: Request for input on the FTE process from CAPRA
Attachments: CAPRA+Process+for+FTE+Requests_AY+12-13.pdf;
CAPRA+Process+for+FTE+Requests_+AY+11-12.pdf

School Executive Committee chairs and Deans,

As you know, one of the principal roles of the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) on this campus is to advise the Provost on the allocation of new faculty lines. Each year CAPRA, in consultation with the Provost, develops a process for requesting new faculty lines and a set of criteria by which those requests are evaluated. Last year's process differed significantly from that used in prior years, particularly in asking that FTE requests originate from graduate groups. CAPRA is now discussing the process to be adopted for this year, and we would like to solicit feedback from both the faculty and the deans on what aspects of last year's process did and did not work and what you would like to see done differently. Whatever input you would like to provide will be appreciated. To jog your memory, I have attached the CAPRA calls for FTE requests for each of the past two years.

Please send your comments to me (amkelley@ucmerced.edu) and to CAPRA analyst Simrin Takhar (stakhar@ucmerced.edu). Your comments will be most useful if received by Nov. 3.

Anne Kelley
Chair, CAPRA

Anne Myers Kelley
Chair, Chemistry and Chemical Biology graduate group Secretary-Treasurer, APS Division of Laser Science University of California, Merced
5200 North Lake Road, Merced, CA 95343
Tel. 209-228-4345
amkelley@ucmerced.edu
Lab web site: <http://faculty.ucmerced.edu/amkelley/>
Graduate spectroscopy textbook: <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0470946709.html>