

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)**  
**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**AY 2015-2016**

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) held a total of 14 regularly scheduled in-person meetings, 1 specially-convened meeting in June 2016 with the Provost/EVC, and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.IV.1](#).

This was the inaugural year for the implementation of the Provost/EVC's Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI) for faculty hiring (see annual reports from [2012-2013](#), [2013-2014](#), and [2014-2015](#) for background). The six research pillars that were intended to guide the investment of resources and ladder-rank faculty hiring for the next six years are: Towards a Sustainable Planet ("Sustainability"), Computational Science and Data Analytics (CSDA), Chemical and Biological Materials and Matter, Entrepreneurship and Management, Human Health Science, and Inequality, Power and Social Justice (IPSJ).

The three pillars that were previously selected to receive FTE lines this year were Sustainability, CSDA, and IPSJ.

While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on CAPRA's role in the SAFI process as well as preparing for the review of requests for "foundational" (traditional, disciplinary, non-SAFI) FTE lines.

CAPRA also benefited from regular consultation with the Provost/EVC who attended nearly all the meetings this academic year.

*SAFI and Pillars*

In fall 2015, CAPRA met with the steering committee chairs or representatives of the Sustainability, CSDA, and IPSJ pillars to hear their hiring plans and provide input. While CAPRA looked forward to seeing the widest range of cogent, proposed hiring plans, it shared the faculty's deep concern over the late timeline of the SAFI process and hoped that the Provost/EVC would agree that faculty hiring should begin earlier in the

“season”. Several disciplines that begin recruiting in August and September were greatly disadvantaged as it was already too late for them to fill positions for next year.

The Provost/EVC requested to meet with each of the three pillars to discuss which areas within each pillar theme they propose to target this year. The pillars were also required to submit to the Provost/EVC a short description of the specific sub themes within each pillar and to include a list of questions the Provost/EVC suggested they address.

After meeting with the representatives from the three pillars, CAPRA found that all three had the same concerns, namely, the late timeline and the fear that several disciplines are already disadvantaged, the various unknowns surrounding the formation and role of search committees, and the role and level of authority of the Council of Deans in the selection of candidates. Another source of confusion was the rank of faculty. Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Camfield informed CAPRA that all pillars have the option of hiring assistant professors and tenured professors from one pool and that the Provost/EVC will clarify this with the pillars’ leadership.

In the beginning of spring semester 2016, CAPRA agreed that it should conduct a review of the SAFI process thus far in order to provide guidance to the three pillars that are scheduled to hire faculty next year. Possible dimensions or evaluative criteria that CAPRA considered when evaluating the SAFI process were timing, inclusiveness, and efficiency. While CAPRA recognized that this is the first time the campus has undergone a SAFI process and the first full cycle is not yet complete, the committee nevertheless wanted to make suggestions to the Provost/EVC on how to improve the process next year.

In January, it became evident that the CSDA pillar was the farthest along in the process and by this time had formulated search committees, posted faculty position advertisements, and already received numerous applications. The IPSJ pillar, upon receiving negative feedback from the Provost/EVC on its proposed hiring process and sub-themes, elected to re-start its process again next year. The Sustainability pillar was still in the process of populating its steering committee in anticipation of posting job advertisements.

As part of its evaluation of the SAFI process, CAPRA invited the CSDA and Sustainability steering committee chairs and search committee chairs to meet with CAPRA to hear their input about the timelines of key events of the SAFI process and

their opinions of the efficiency of the overall process. The CSDA representatives reported the following challenges and input: 1) candidates wished to know which bylaw unit they would be assigned to and some faculty members in the pillar felt that the cluster's sub advertisements should have been clearer in this regard. 2) the Academic Personnel office ran the diversity statistics for the search, and while CSDA was not informed of the numerical value assigned to the diversity benchmarks, they were told they reached them. The Council of Deans, with the pillar's permission, provided input on the diversity of CSDA's candidates, and, helped narrow down the long list to create a short list of candidates. CSDA leadership stated that they will recommend to the Provost/EVC that 1) the search committee should draft the job advertisements next time, not the steering committee; 2) once the steering committee defines the cluster, the search committee should form immediately and then take over with the drafting of the language of the job advertisements, and 3) the decision on the hiring of the four faculty members under this pillar should be made by the search committee after consulting with the relevant AP units. The hiring decision should not be made by the Council of Deans.

#### *SAFI Survey*

As a result of negative feedback and concern from faculty colleagues, CAPRA members discussed the possibility of conducting a second survey of faculty for the purposes of data collection on the process of the cluster hiring (the committee conducted a survey last year on SAFI). It was too early to determine whether these future hires, if made, are as successful or more successful had they occurred under a traditional, non-cluster hiring process. However, CAPRA reasoned that a survey conducted at the end of this semester could be used to provide guidance to the pillars that are scheduled to conduct faculty searches next year.

In May 2016, CAPRA sought input from campus faculty members who have expertise in surveys to help draft a more nuanced and cohesive survey. The survey was also shared with Division Council for input. The final version of the survey, in conjunction with the Provost/EVC, was then issued to all Senate faculty members and included multiple choice questions and text boxes for comments. Sixty-seven percent of eligible members voted and the macro-level conclusions from CAPRA were 1) a majority do not support SAFI in its current form, 2) there is support for SAFI in a modified form, but the faculty consensus is that 20% or fewer FTE lines should be allocated to it, 3) a majority

of the faculty see a benefit to the cluster hiring process but there is no consensus on which elements are superior, and 4) there seems to be faculty support for cluster hiring, however at a much more limited scale.

The results of the survey with comments (respondents' identities were kept confidential) were submitted to all Senate faculty, the Provost/EVC, and the Chancellor. The raw data results that did not include the comments, as well as CAPRA's macro and micro-level analyses of the results, were submitted to the Provost/EVC.

On June 23, CAPRA and the Provost/EVC met to discuss the survey results and the analysis. The Provost/EVC acknowledged the majority of respondents were not in favor of the SAFI process or allocating such a high percentage of FTE lines to pillars. However, he also stated that he is unwilling to completely eliminate the SAFI process as this would disadvantage the pillars that are currently hiring faculty or are in advanced stages of preparation for forming searches. The Provost/EVC agreed that he will issue an all-faculty communication that indicates 1) his desire to hold conversations with faculty members in fall 2016 to prepare for the following year's hires, 2) his willingness to reduce the number of FTE lines he intended to go to pillars as well as his approval for faculty members to disband their current collaborations and form new ones, and 3) a re-articulation of how many FTE lines will go to foundational areas and how many will be allocated to the pillars.

#### *Foundational (Non-SAFI) FTEs*

As it does each fall semester, CAPRA reviewed and revised its annual process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests in preparation for FTE request review in spring semester. The committee decided not to include SAFI considerations or guidance for cluster hiring in the document; rather, the criteria would only apply to foundational FTE requests. CAPRA and the Provost/EVC agreed that SAFI/cluster hiring and foundational hiring would proceed in a separate but parallel manner with CAPRA being consulted on both. The revised document for the criteria for evaluation was finalized by CAPRA in September 2015 and shared with the Provost/EVC for input. Receiving no input on the criteria for evaluation document by October 2015, CAPRA requested an update from the Provost/EVC who asked if he should still proceed with the formal call for FTE requests or if CAPRA wished him to expedite the process by asking the deans to submit their foundational FTE priorities to CAPRA immediately. CAPRA agreed that, given the late timeline, it would be more efficient to simply ask the

deans to submit their priorities now for this year's hires and to issue a formal call at a later time for FTE requests for next year's hires.

At the end of October 2015, CAPRA received the foundational FTE priorities from each dean. The committee held a lengthy discussion and while there were only four foundational FTE lines for allocation, CAPRA members decided to recommend six areas that should receive foundational FTE lines. CAPRA members then informed the Provost/EVC of its recommendations along with the rationale for its priority rankings. The committee's recommendations were formally submitted via memo to the Provost/EVC and the Senate Chair.

In early December 2015, the Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that he sent a memo to the deans with his decision on the allocation of foundational FTE lines. Instead of allocating four lines as was originally announced in the Provost/EVC's hiring plan distributed to the campus in spring 2014, he allocated six lines as recommended by CAPRA. Three lines were allocated to SSHA, two to SNS, and one to SOE.

In January 2016, CAPRA again reviewed its criteria for the evaluation of foundational FTE requests and re-submitted it to the Provost/EVC with a request that it be sent to the schools as soon as possible.

In mid-February, the Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that he had no revisions to the document. CAPRA then formally submitted the document to the Provost/EVC via email, with a request that he send to the schools as soon as possible so that CAPRA can review the foundational FTE requests and provide rankings to the Provost/EVC by the end of April. CAPRA suggested the deadline of April 8 for the deans to send their FTE requests, giving the deans a timeline of almost two months.

When the document had not been sent to the deans by mid-March, the Provost/EVC stated that his delay in submitting the document was due to pressing campus issues and strategic planning events. He suggested minor revisions to the document to which CAPRA agreed, and on March 18, the Provost/EVC submitted his FTE letter to the school deans with CAPRA's document appended.

On April 20, CAPRA finalized its review of the foundational FTE requests and shared its recommended rankings with the Provost/EVC at the end of the meeting and later,

formally, via email communication. The Provost/EVC announced that he will issue his final FTE allocation decision to the campus before the end of spring semester.

#### *Space Planning and Allocation*

CAPRA's other main function, in addition to advising the Provost/EVC on FTE allocation, is space planning and allocation. The Provost/EVC asked CAPRA for assistance on how he should communicate to the faculty that while the campus is still planning to hire 150 faculty members over the next six years, the campus will have to be very strategic about whom it hires due to the critical space shortage. The campus may have to hire fewer numbers of faculty over the first few years of the six-year plan, and higher numbers in the later years.

The 2020 Project calls for 10,000 undergraduate students and 1,000 graduate students and CAPRA remained concerned about space implications. The Provost/EVC shared this concern and stated that he will consult CAPRA for input once the 2020 project plans are nearing implementation. It is crucial that space be found especially for academic units, new faculty, and incoming graduate students.

#### *Consultation with Provost/EVC*

At the January 20 meeting, the Provost/EVC announced that he and the deans were in the midst of drafting a document related to the transition to a new school academic structure. This draft reorganization document would first be shared with the Chancellor for approval and then distributed to the faculty. The goal is to ensure that if the school academic structure does change, it will solve the problems that faculty members have raised with the current state of affairs.

The Provost/EVC asked CAPRA to hold the draft document in confidence which the committee honored. After reviewing the draft, CAPRA responded to the Provost/EVC to state that given the scope and impact of the proposed plan, it requires much broader feedback—even in its initial draft form—than can be provided by CAPRA alone. Soliciting feedback from bylaw unit/AP chairs will insure that perspectives from all faculty will surface and help shape the conversation about reorganization. Secondly, CAPRA noted that the draft this reorganization plan did not address the memo that was written and signed by all bylaw chairs and sent to the Provost/EVC and deans last year. In that memo, the chairs urged the administration to undertake a collaborative

reorganization effort. In sum, CAPRA elected not to provide official feedback on the draft reorganization plan until all faculty have had the opportunity to review it.

CAPRA also opined on the following issues:

#### *2020 Project*

Throughout the academic year, CAPRA benefited from consultation with Vice Chancellor of Budget & Planning Dan Feitelberg and AVC of Real Estate Abigail Rider. Given that this year would see the choosing of the design team that would be hired to build the campus for the 2020 Project, CAPRA members were interested in monitoring 2020 Project developments.

CAPRA helped find faculty members to attend the series of design team meetings in fall 2015. The committee made requests during the year to view the technical specification documents and to allow these documents to be shared with faculty members so they can make informed recommendations in their meetings with the design teams. However, the committee appreciated that there were legal impediments to executing this request.

The Regents voted to approve the 2020 Project in December 2015.

Financial proposals were received by the campus in April. Technical expert panels (which included faculty members) were convened to judge the proposals on seven categories. All comments were to be sent to the evaluation committee which included Vice Chancellors (excluding VC Feitelberg and VC for Business & Administrative Services Michael Reese), faculty members from each of the three schools, and a representative from Staff Assembly. CAPRA's main interest was the category related to academic facilities, and in February, VC Feitelberg and AVC Rider attended another committee meeting to explain the rating system for the proposals.

The committee's final consultation of the year with VC Feitelberg occurred in May 2016, when CAPRA members requested clarification on the source of the external funding for the 2020 Project as well as the source and amount of internal funding. CAPRA believed it was important that these questions be addressed so the campus can plan for future faculty FTE lines and ensure it has the appropriate amount of start-up funds for new

faculty members. VC Feitelberg provided an overview of the campus's Long Range Financial Model that was developed to help assess financial capacity and risk for campus operations and capital investments. Expenditures included in the model included instruction, faculty start-up, and academic support. VC Feitelberg confirmed that the 2020 Project's budget forecasting spans a 40-year time period and contains various assumptions, such as 1) the 10,000 undergraduate student enrollment projected in the 2020 Project if successful, 2) an allocation of State general funds with the existing MOU, and 3) gross resident tuition revenue.

VC Feitelberg also provided the fiscal year 2015-2016 all-funds base budget and the 2016-2017 preliminary budget.

#### *Budget*

Early in the academic year, CAPRA pointed out to the Provost EVC that CAPRA's charge includes a statement that CAPRA is to meet with the Chancellor's designee 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." CAPRA has not had this opportunity for the past few years. The Provost/EVC acknowledged the last two years were a transition period with regard to the campus budget but agreed that moving forward, CAPRA should receive this information and provide input to him on the subject matter.

In October 2015, AVC of Finance Donna Jones distributed to CAPRA campus budget information that was previously created for the Chancellor's Cabinet and attended a committee meeting to present the information. In May 2016, VC Feitelberg also provided the fiscal year 2015-2016 all-funds base budget and the 2016-2017 preliminary budget.

#### *Assessment*

CAPRA benefited from updates from its Vice Chair, who, by virtue of this position, serves on the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). Major topics of discussion at PROC included the ES graduate program review (the first graduate program to undergo review), the Anthropology review, and discussions on the American Studies minor with regard to its low enrollment and implications for review.



*Systemwide Review Items*

- UCPB updates. The major topics of discussion this year were the proposed increased undergraduate enrollment across the ten campuses, the retirement options task force report, updates on self-supporting programs, campus budget deficits, and UCOP's proposal for performance-based costing.
- Retirement Options Task Force Report. CAPRA's position was that new retirement benefit rules will substantially reduce the retirement benefits for new hires and will significantly impact UCM's ability to recruit and retain top faculty.
- Guiding Principles for Search Waivers for Academic Appointees. CAPRA supported the principles insofar as they clarify the current search waiver process that provides flexibility in faculty hiring. However, the committee hope that that faculty members' ability to obtain waivers for other academic positions such as postdoctoral scholars, project scientists, and junior specialists is not adversely affected

*Campus Review Items*

- CAPRA reviewed and endorsed the Honors Task Force report, the MIST PhD proposal (but retained concerns about the program's proposed plan to support graduate students), the revised GASP major proposal (after its concerns about rigor of the curriculum and LPSOE FTE lines were alleviated), and the proposed minor in World Heritage (after it received clarification on the duties of the proposed, full-time lecturer beyond alleviating the teaching workload of current ladder-rank faculty members).
- Revised Academic Degree Policy. CAPRA believed the policy is too restrictive on who can initiate a proposal for a new academic degree unit and suggested the language be clarified to state that the academic unit or graduate group chair initiates the proposal.

Respectfully submitted:

***CAPRA members:***

Mukesh Singhal, Chair (SOE) – UCPB representative.

Anne Kelley, Vice Chair (SNS)

Josh Viers, Senate Vice Chair (SOE) and CAPRA chair in September 2015.

Marilyn Fogel, (SNS)

Nate Monroe (SSHA)

Kurt Schnier (SSHA) from April 2016. Replaced Will Shadish, dec. March 2016.

***Ex officio, non-voting member:***

Cristián Ricci, Senate Chair (SSHA)

***Student Representatives:***

Lauren Edwards, Graduate Student Representative, GSA

Hunter Drobenaire, Undergraduate Student Representative, ASUCM

***Senate Staff:***

Simrin Takhar