

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)****Wednesday, February 11, 2015****9:00 – 10:00 am****KL 324**[UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources](#)

- I. Chair's Report** – Anne Kelley
- A. Updates from January 21 Division Council meeting.
  - B. Updates from the February 3 UCPB meeting.
- II. Consent Calendar** **Pg. 1-3**
- Action requested:** approval of minutes from January 14 meeting
- III. February 5 Joint Meeting with Division Council and Provost** **Pg. 4-12**
- Discussion:** meeting with the Provost/EVC and Division Council regarding FTE allocation and strategic academic focusing.

Last semester, in anticipation of a FTE requests process, CAPRA revised and finalized its criteria for the evaluation of FTE requests.

**Action requested:** CAPRA to revise the criteria and evaluations procedures further in light of the Provost/EVC's announced plans on February 5.

- IV. February 12 Joint Meeting with Division Council and VCPB Feitelberg**
- Informational:** On February 12, CAPRA and Division Council will meet with Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dan Feitelberg to discuss Project 2020. Three short-listed developer teams for the 2020 Project want to meet with campus stakeholders, including representative faculty, between now and the issuance of the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) this spring. VC Feitelberg will discuss the pre-RFP consultations at the February 12 meeting to understand the expectations of faculty for these visits.
- V. Review of Committee Bylaws** **Pg. 13**
- Division Council has asked all Senate standing committees to review its bylaws and submit any revisions for consideration. Revisions would be subjected to a faculty vote this semester.

Suggested revisions to the CAPRA bylaws are appended to this packet.

**Action requested:** CAPRA members to review the suggested revisions and vote to send them to Division Council for consideration.

**VI. Other Business**

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**January 14, 2015**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on January 14, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

Attendees: Anne Kelley, Jan Wallander, Mukesh Singhal, and Marilyn Fogel. Absent: Cristian Ricci, Josh Viers, Daisy Figueroa, and Danielle Bermudez.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley updated CAPRA members on the UCBP meeting held on January 6.

The main topics of discussion included 1) UCRP funding challenges. 2) Self-supporting programs. Some campuses have been converting state programs into self-supporting programs. The problem with self-supporting programs is the lack of suitable oversight of these programs in terms of academics and they are being viewed as convenient revenue streams. 3) Closing the faculty salary gap/remuneration gap. UCOP stated there would be a 3% increase in faculty salaries next year but it is unclear as to how the amount will be distributed. UCPB discussed what type of advice to provide UCOP on this matter. The dilemma is whether to raise salary scales or should both scales and off scale increments be raised?

II. Consent Calendar

**ACTION:** The November 19 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. Campus Review Items

--revised minor from SSHA to establish a community research and service minor. CAPRA's main comments to SSHA's original proposal last academic year were: 1) teaching assignments and workload and 2) strategic focusing areas. CAPRA members noted that the revised proposal addressed these concerns. While CAPRA still has minor concerns about teaching workload and the distribution of the \$2,000 faculty stipends, the committee endorsed the revised proposal as it believes that this minor is a creative endeavor and

will be beneficial to students in all three schools, especially in light of the campus being granted classification for community engagement by the Carnegie Foundation.

**ACTION:** CAPRA analyst will draft a memo to be circulated among committee members for review and approval by January 26.

--Graduate Council's proposed revisions for procedures for submitting proposals for graduate groups. CAPRA members' only comment pertained to the statement in the first paragraph that proposals should be written to make the case that the proposed program fits at the mission of UC Merced. The "mission statement" currently available on the UC Merced [website](#) is more of a background and history than a true mission statement. Therefore, CAPRA recommends that the GC revisions document quote the relevant mission to which its referring, or else eliminate reference to the mission of UC Merced.

**ACTION:** CAPRA analyst will draft a memo to be circulated among committee members for review and approval at the January 28 meeting.

--ORU Review

VCR Traina recently drafted a policy for the review of ORUs. CAPRA members were unclear as to how the ORU review policy relates to the comprehensive set of policies drafted by the Committee on Research (COR) – and sent to the administration - in AY 13-14 pertaining to the establishment and review of research units, including ORUs. CAPRA requests clarification from the VCR on how his policy aligns with COR's current policy.

**ACTION:** CAPRA analyst will draft a memo to be circulated among committee members for review and approval at the January 28 meeting.

--Establishment of Centers

The Provost/EVC recently drafted a policy on the establishment of centers. CAPRA members had two main concerns with two components of the procedures:

First, regarding the principle that “centers should contribute to the teaching, research and outreach missions of the campus, School, and/or Unit faculties”, centers should not have to contribute to each of these missions, as centers can be formed for only one purpose. CAPRA members suggested that the first “and” be replaced by “and/or”.

Second, with regard to the principle that the Provost/EVC makes a decision on the reappointment of center directors, what is the mechanism for determining reappointment or removal?

**ACTION:** CAPRA analyst will draft a memo to be circulated among committee members for review and approval at the January 28 meeting.

CAPRA members then discussed the memo it sent to the Provost/EVC on November 21, 2014, requesting the release of disciplinary FTE lines so the campus can begin preparing for next year’s faculty hires. CAPRA members noted that their individual schools are also discussing this issue and there is confusion over how to plan for “strategic hires”. Faculty members are asking for the formula of disciplinary versus strategic hires. CAPRA members suggested that the Provost/EVC be invited to a future CAPRA meeting to provide updates on the strategic academic focusing initiative and whether he would release a subset of disciplinary FTE lines. The CAPRA chair also suggested sending a reminder to the Provost/EVC on CAPRA’s prior request.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), Division  
Council (DivCo), and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson  
Minutes of Meeting  
February 5, 2015**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation and Division Council met with Provost/EVC Peterson at 2:00 pm on February 5, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, CAPRA Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

CAPRA Chair Kelley summarized the intention of this meeting, which was to follow up on CAPRA's requests to the Provost on releasing a subset of foundational FTE lines independent of the strategic academic focusing process.

Provost/EVC Peterson updated DivCo and CAPRA members on the following two items:

--The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget Dan Feitelberg participated in the February 3 meeting of the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB) to discuss UC Merced's Project 2020. Provost Peterson related that he was quite encouraged by the committee members' responses; Chair Kelley (the CAPRA representative to UCPB) agreed that the committee was positive about Merced's future planning. The same day, the Provost, VC Feitelberg, Chancellor Leland, and VC for Business and Administrative Services Michael Reese met with President Napolitano to present an information item regarding Project 2020 to the Regents. President Napolitano is supportive of UC Merced's efforts.

--The strategic academic focusing working group met on February 2 and Provost Peterson stated that the process is ready to move forward to the implementation stage. After input from the faculty, it was decided that the focus area Research for Societal Benefit will be split into two groups: health and social justice/humanities. Much work still remains, but the process of identifying the names of the focus areas is completed.

Provost Peterson then stated the main factors that will influence FTE allocations: 1) how much money the campus has for the continuing costs of salaries and benefits and the one-time cost of start-up packages, and 2) how much space is available. Provost Peterson tasked the school deans last summer with providing quantitative data on all

space: laboratories, offices, graduate students, etc. Once these two items are confirmed, the Provost then has to determine 1) how to determine the proportion of FTE lines between foundational and focus areas; 2) how to allocate FTE lines across the six focus areas; 3) how to allocate FTE lines within the individual focus areas, and 4) how to allocate FTEs to the foundational areas and bylaw 55 units.

The Provost stated that his goal is to translate strategic academic focusing into 3-5 year rolling plans. While faculty members will plan for each year, the expectation is that faculty will think strategically about the out years. Instituting a long-range plan will also give faculty assurance that if their own area is not identified for an FTE lines in one year, their area will receive one in a later year. Lastly, the advantage of a long-range plan is that it encourages accountability, that is to say, faculty members must provide a solid argument for why any deviation from the plan must occur.

The Provost emphasized that there will not be a uniform allocation across the foundational areas over the years; rather, he will have a strategy for investing in any given area. Any change to that investment will involve faculty input.

Provost Peterson assured the faculty in attendance that he has given much thought to how best to engage the faculty, schools, and CAPRA with regard to FTE allocation. He intends to follow the traditional process of seeking FTE requests from the schools, and asking CAPRA to review them and provide him with recommendations. The final decisions, as usual, will reside in the Provost's office.

The Provost then shared his thoughts on how he envisions the process:

How to allocate FTE positions within the focus areas? The Provost announced he will rely on initial input from the faculty members who were heavily engaged in the strategic academic focusing process in terms of submitting proposals. He will also seek advice from those faculty members on which bylaw 55 units those positions should be allocated. If one focus area is allocated three FTE lines, then the Provost expects all affected bylaw 55 units to be engaged in the negotiation and conversations. Once FTE requests are decided at this level, the requests will be vetted through CAPRA.

When FTE allocations span more than one focus area, then the initial recommendation on how to proceed will originate from the Provost. However, he will seek input from

the schools and CAPRA. Final decisions will always originate from the Provost, but the key is what stage in the process the Provost will seek faculty and Senate input.

The Provost announced that he will release FTE lines as soon as he is apprised of the budget and space situation. He acknowledged that while he believes he can implement an FTE process for both foundational and focus hires simultaneously next year, some focus areas are more prepared than others, which means he has to invest resources sequentially. And, this is why a 3-5 year plan is crucial: focus areas that do not receive FTE lines next year can plan to receive them in the out years.

In response to a DivCo member's question, the Provost stated that in the first year, he will allocate a larger fraction of resources to the foundational areas than the focus areas in later years. However, the majority of resources must eventually be made into the focus areas, otherwise, the strategic academic focusing initiative would have been wasted. Focus FTE lines will still be assigned to bylaw 55 units; the strategic academic focusing process is just a means to prioritize how to place FTE lines in those units.

A DivCo member pointed out that many faculty members are not in favor of 3-5 year strategic plans, because in the past, after completing them, plans changed and negated the effort made into formulating those plans. He asked the Provost whether he has a reliable idea of how much funding is available in order for faculty to generate robust 3-5 year plans. The Provost responded that while he does not yet have concrete funding numbers, he would not invest in an area unless he knows in advance that that area's hiring trajectory will be positive.

A DivCo member mentioned that there appears to be no institutional body to facilitate the conversations and negotiations between focus areas. It is concerning that if a focus area spans two schools, and FTE positions could potentially be assigned to multiple bylaw 55 units, there is no conduit through which to convey this to the Provost. The Provost replied that in the past, FTE requests have originated from the bylaw 55 units, with the exception of one year, when requests were submitted by graduate groups.

A CAPRA member pointed out that graduate groups have well-defined memberships. Under the strategic focusing process, the membership of faculty is unclear: theoretically, faculty members could join any group they wish. The Provost responded that the same



faculty members that expressed interest in proposing the focus areas are expected to take the lead to propose where to allocate the FTE lines.

A DivCo member asked the Provost whether his office could help the faculty caucus to give the faculty members some guidance. To begin the process, the Provost could convene the lead writers of the focus area proposals. Another DivCo member stated that faculty members are worried that not all the relevant parties will be at the table. The Provost assured him that he will not exclude faculty who did not participate in the strategic academic focusing process but he also wants to recognize those who provided leadership in this area.

A CAPRA member inquired whether the Provost has a final description of the six focus areas so faculty members can better determine where they fit in. The Provost replied that the members of the strategic academic focusing working group are working with faculty members who proposed the focus areas to finalize one-page descriptions of each area. The descriptions will include the academic description of each area and a description intended for external audiences for development purposes. The Provost also asked faculty to speak to him if they think any part of this process is exclusionary.

The Provost agreed that CAPRA does not need to know the exact number of FTE lines for allocation in order to begin the FTE requests process with the schools. However, he stated that the proportionality between foundational and focus areas would change depending on the number of positions the campus has. If the number of positions were limited, a higher percentage would go to the foundational areas. CAPRA can begin the requests process now.

The Provost emphasized the need for FTE requests to be quantitative about growth: number of students, external funding sources, and other outcome-based metrics.

A CAPRA member suggested the need to conduct a retrospective study, five years from now, to assess whether the strategic planning we complete this year materialized. We need a formal repository of information. This would require the appropriate archival data and documentation from the Provost to CAPRA and DivCo. CAPRA has not received such information in the past. The Provost agreed and asked for suggestions on what data CAPRA would require, and which units could generate it, including IRDS and the Provost's office. The Provost also mentioned that he is investing in Academic

Analytics which should show him, among other indicators, how our campus compares nationally and internationally to other institutions.

A CAPRA member expressed concern over faculty fatigue with regard to formulating 3-5 year plans. Are we asking faculty to generate multi-year plans now at the same time we are asking them to request FTE lines? Or, will we ask for multi-year plans next year? The Provost responded that he already has a rich source of information in the focus area proposals and strategic plans the faculty have already proposed. He has taken them all into serious consideration and will not call for new bylaw 55 units strategic plans.

The discussion then turned to faculty members' concerns over space and the uncertainty surrounding who is assigned to which lab space. There are also continuing challenges with moving faculty from Castle to S&E 2. The Provost acknowledged the ongoing problems and reiterated that he is relying on the school deans to accurately assess the space they have available. If needed, the Provost will step in and take a role in identifying available space.

A CAPRA member inquired about the role of ORUs in the strategic academic focusing process. Since the focus areas are interdisciplinary and FTE lines will involve multiple schools and bylaw 55 units, identifying the appropriate individuals to work together is crucial. An ORU could fill that role. In addition, though, there appears to be no defined way for ORUs to grow in the 2020 plan, either in terms of space or positions. The Provost responded that he is aware of the importance of ORUs in the strategic academic focusing process and has been working with VCR Traina on space considerations for ORUs as we build towards 2020.

The Provost ended by emphasizing his desire for faculty input throughout the process and encouraged faculty to contact him with any concerns.

Minutes taken by: Simrin Takhar, Academic Senate office.

## **UC Merced CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation) Process and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty FTE Requests for AY 2015-2016**

Requests for new faculty lines (FTEs) may be initiated by the Bylaw 55 units, graduate groups, or recognized campus or multicampus research institutes. 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.

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).

It is expected that each new faculty position will be assigned primarily to a single School. If a particular position may contribute significantly to more than one School, whether through a split appointment or otherwise, the justification for that position should include supporting letter(s) from the Dean and/or the program faculty of the other School. Cluster hires (multiple positions in different disciplinary units and/or Schools that support research in a common area) are encouraged. Each position that is considered part of a cluster hire should be identified as such in the position description.

In addition to the ranked FTE requests, CAPRA requests that each School submit (1) a table listing, for each requested FTE, the level of the position, the principal graduate and undergraduate programs in which this person is expected to participate, expected space, startup, and other infrastructure requirements, and the Dean's and Faculty's priority rankings; (2) a table listing all faculty currently holding appointments in the School, with their unit and graduate group affiliations and the principal undergraduate programs in which they teach; (3) a table listing all currently approved but unfilled positions. Please see Appendices 1-3 for examples.

The final position descriptions, prioritizations, and supporting tables are due **February 15, 2015** to the Senate office ([senateoffice@ucmerced.edu](mailto:senateoffice@ucmerced.edu)) and the Provost's office ([provostevc@ucmerced.edu](mailto:provostevc@ucmerced.edu)).

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 existing or proposed organized research units or academic units on campus or systemwide.
4. Support of undergraduate majors and undergraduate teaching needs.

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

Appendix 1: Sample Table of Requested FTEs

Name of position	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Primary Grad Group	Secondary Grad Group(s) (optional)	Primary Major	Secondary Major(s) (optional)	Est. startup costs	Est. space and other infrastructure needs	Priority (Dean)	Priority (Faculty)

Appendix 2: Sample Table of Current School Faculty

Name	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Bylaw 55 Unit	Primary Grad Group	Secondary Grad Group(s)	Primary Undergrad Major	Secondary Undergrad Major(s)

Appendix 3: Sample Table of Unfilled Positions

Name of position	Replacement (for whom?) or new position?	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Primary Graduate Group	Secondary Graduate Group(s) (optional)	Primary Major	Secondary Major(s) (optional)	Estimated startup costs	Estimated space and other infrastructure needs

UC Merced Bylaw Part II.IV.1.

1. Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

A. Membership: This committee consists of at least six members of the Merced Division and two student members: a Chair, a Vice Chair, the Vice Chair of the Division, one Senate member from each School, one graduate student representative, and one undergraduate student representative. Senate membership should include broad representation from schools and academic programs.

B. Duties

1. Meets with the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee at the beginning of each academic year for a briefing on all sources of revenue for the Merced campus, the allocation of revenue to units of the campus, and budgetary planning for the succeeding academic year.

2. Assesses budgetary proposals and requests, including requests for allocation of faculty positions (FTE) for succeeding academic years.

3. Confers with and advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and Divisional administrative agencies regarding policy on academic planning, budget and resource allocations.

4. ~~Initiates and coordinates studies or reviews of existing and proposed academic schools, colleges, and degree programs as they relate to academic planning, budget, and resource allocation, and to report thereon to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or to the Divisional Council and Divisional Assembly as it may deem appropriate. Reviews academic units and degree programs as they relate to academic planning, budget, and resource allocation, and reports thereon to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or to the Divisional Council and Divisional Assembly as appropriate.~~

5. On matters relating to academic planning and budget, receives reports from, and maintain liaison with, the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council.

6. Reports regularly to the Divisional Council and the Divisional Assembly on matters under consideration.

7. Receives reports from, and maintains liaison with, the University Committee on Planning and Budget.