

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

**Tuesday, November 12, 2013**

**2:30 – 4:00 pm**

**KL 362**

**Documents found at [UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources](#)**

**AGENDA**

---

**I. Chair's Report – *Anne Kelley***

- A. Update from UCPB meeting on November 5.
  - i. Composite Benefit Rates
- B. Update from Joint Division Council/CAPRA meeting with Provost Peterson on November 7

**II. Consent Calendar**

- A. Approval of the agenda
- B. Approval of the October 29 meeting minutes Pg. 1

**III. CCGA Proposals for Review**

- A. Electrical Engineering & Computer Science (EECS) Pg. 4-5  
Two CAPRA members have completed their reviews of the EECS proposal. The reviews are appended to this agenda and posted on CROPS at [UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Review Items – Campus/EECS Proposal](#)
- B. Sociology

**Action requested:** CAPRA to discuss the reviews of the two CCGA proposals. Deadline for comments is November 25.

**IV. Conflict of Interest Policy**

Pg. 6

**Action requested:** Review and approve the draft conflict of interest statement for CAPRA.

**V. FTE Requests****A. Questions for CAPRA.**

- i. Should we post initial requests for review and comment by all faculty?
- ii. What do we want to say, if anything, about cluster hires?
- iii. Should LPSOEs be separately prioritized and should we have separate criteria for them?
- iv. Should we specifically ask whether a requested FTE represents the initiation of a new program or disciplinary area?

B. Draft 3 of proposed process and criteria for FTE requests Pg. 7

C. Feedback received from School Executive Committees Pg. 9  
Background. On October 16, Chair Kelley asked the School Executive Committees for feedback on last year's FTE requests process.

**VI. Campuswide Review Item**

A. Diversity memo from Division Council and the Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity & Academic Freedom. Pg. 12-13

**Action requested:** CAPRA to provide comments on the list of questions contained in the Division Council memo. One set of comments has been received and is appended to this agenda. CAPRA analyst will compile all comments and transmit to the Senate Chair by the deadline of November 22.

**VII. Other Business**

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**October 29, 2013**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 2:30 pm on October 29, 2013 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

**I. Chair's Report**

CAPRA member Wallander provided a brief update on the October 22 Division Council meeting. A Division Council member had inquired about CAPRA including diversity as a criterion for the FTE request process.

**II. Consent Calendar**

Today's agenda and the October 15 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

**III. Conflict of Interest Policy**

Chair Kelley summarized the discussion from the last CAPRA meeting on October 15. CAPRA members had decided that UC Riverside's planning and budget committee's statement was inadequate for CAPRA's needs. The committee members have since reviewed the conflict of interest statements and recusal policies from Berkeley, Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz that were compiled by the committee analyst. Upon further review, it is apparent that none of the policies align well with UCM's CAPRA as our committee and Senate are unique. However, the Berkeley policy could be adapted to CAPRA's needs with some revisions.

As discussed in the last CAPRA meeting, members agreed that they would not vote on their specific programs. The vote for the remainder of the committee members will be calculated on an average. An issue that CAPRA must resolve is whether to allow all members to discuss all FTE requests in order to provide expertise and background. A CAPRA member pointed out that they are representing the faculty at large and are not here to serve as

advocates of their own research programs. CAPRA is a campus-wide committee and should act for the good of the campus as a whole. CAPRA members also emphasized that the committee should not draft a statement that is too prescriptive.

ACTION: Chair Kelley will draft a conflict of interest statement loosely based on the UC Berkeley procedures. The draft will be circulated among the committee for review and approval before being transmitted to DivCo.

#### IV. FTE Requests Process

Chair Kelley reminded the committee of the joint DivCo/CAPRA meeting on November 7. There is still much information to be learned about the Strategic Focusing initiative. Committee members discussed the feasibility of the November due date for first drafts of proposals by groups of faculty members. CAPRA members were reminded that at the joint meeting on November 7, the Provost wants a list of processes that went wrong during last year's FTE request cycle so that going forward, we can improve the process. Chair Kelley contacted School Executive committees and requested they submit their comments on items that did not work last year with a due date of November 3. To date, CAPRA has received one comment. All comments will be compiled into a memo and submitted to the Provost in advance of the November 7 joint meeting.

Prior to this meeting, Chair Kelley revised the FTE criteria draft and summarized the main points. CAPRA will request rankings from both the program and Dean along with justification from each. The committee discussed how to address cross-School position requests. It was decided that CAPRA will request that positions have a primary School but Deans from the affiliate School are invited to endorse the request and submit a brief justification. Schools should feel free to collaborate and not feel as though they are in competition with each other.

Chair Kelley added another criterion regarding diversity. The argument in favor of this addition is that CAPRA wants to emphasize the importance of

attracting qualified candidates of all levels and backgrounds. However, there is a question of whether CAPRA should be making judgments on this issue. The committee decided that CAPRA is only evaluating the field and the level of positions that are being requested; the committee should not make judgments on the demographics of the individuals who apply to these positions.

ACTION: Chair Kelley will delete the criterion on diversity. The Chair will also revise the draft to include language on cross-School positions.

V. Other Business

A CAPRA member inquired about an email from Chancellor Leland to the campus on Friday, October 25 that stated the “real estate team recently met with stakeholders across campus in 32 focus groups...” Some CAPRA members were unaware of these focus groups. A brief discussion was held on whether the various strategic focusing groups and campus space planning committees on campus include sufficient Senate representation. Chair Kelley confirmed that she attended one focus group meeting earlier this year and she encouraged the meeting organizers to consult with a broader faculty population. CAPRA’s GSA representative mentioned that GSA and ASUCM representatives were invited – with one day’s notice – to attend a planning meeting as well but the meeting did not include broad student representation.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

## **CAPRA Reviewer 1**

EECS program at UC Merced has experienced a healthy growth of graduate students and faculty from 2008 to 2013. The projected growth of the program in 2018-19 academic year includes 14 masters students, 75 Ph.D. students and 15 ladder rank faculty, leading to a 5:1 student to faculty ratio. This is in-line with the SoE 2020 strategic plan.

The CCGA proposal states the need for adequate space, does not specify the detailed need for space to accommodate the projected growth.

The discussions on various means to provide financial support to graduate students are appropriate. These include TA, fellowship from the university, their research grants and their plan to obtain training grants from federal agencies.

EECS program is seriously lack of the content of EE in terms of both course offerings and faculty composition. In the proposed growth path, the EE aspect is still scarce, including the equipment development part of the proposal.

## **CAPRA Reviewer 2**

### **CAPRA review of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science graduate group proposal**

As CAPRA is charged with evaluating the potential impacts of new programs on academic planning, budget, and resource allocations, this review is focused on those issues.

Electrical Engineering and Computer Science has existed by that name as an emphasis area under the umbrella Individual Graduate Program since 2007, offering both M.S. and Ph.D. degrees. The program already boasts 12 Ph.D. and 5 M.S. graduates. This program now seeks approval as a full-fledged graduate group.

As of Fall 2013, the program had 11 core faculty and 33 graduate students, 29 of those in the Ph.D. program. There are two major broad emphasis areas in the current program, intelligent systems and distributed systems and data management, and future plans call for further building these three areas, not introducing additional areas. The proposal discusses growing at a rate of 1-2 faculty per year in the near future and growing the graduate population from 33 to 89 by AY 18-19, with a somewhat larger proportion of M.S. students. These appear to be ambitious goals, although significant growth in the number of graduate student per faculty member appears to be supportable based on student demand for the program, the success of the faculty at winning research grants, and the demand for TAs to support the large undergraduate Computer Science major. The proposal is not very specific on how much additional research space and equipment will be needed to support the planned growth in faculty and students. In any case, it does not appear that significant faculty growth is needed for the program to flourish. The current faculty are able to offer the minimum number of graduate courses required, although of course it would be better for more courses to be offered more often, and because the program has chosen to focus on growing just a couple of research areas, it can achieve strength with a relatively small number of faculty.

My conclusion is that conversion of the EECS graduate program from an emphasis area under the IGP to a full-fledged graduate program would not, in itself, have a significant impact on academic planning, budget, and resource allocations, and that the proposal should move forward.

### **Proposed conflict of interest policy for CAPRA (adapted from UC Berkeley's)**

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 (program, graduate group, institute, or School) 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, abstaining 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 bylaw 55 unit or program) 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.

## **UC Merced CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation)**

### **Process and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty FTE Requests for AY 2013-2014**

#### **Draft 3**

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).

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.

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.

#### 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, other 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

## **School of Natural Sciences Executive Committee Comments**

**Received October 21, 2013 and November 4, 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.

### Comment 2

We are supportive of the idea of graduate groups having control of the FTE allocation for another year. This process might not have made much of a difference for disciplinary-based groups that align more or less directly with the SNS (or SE, SHSA) units, but it made a BIG difference for interdisciplinary graduate groups like Environmental Systems and BEST. Indeed, the ES graduate group has announced a jointly advertised cluster hire in global change science that includes two faculty in SNS and one in SE. This would not have been possible without a graduate group-based FTE allocation. The problem with last year's process was in the implementation. Communication among the effected groups was generally poor (e.g., between graduate groups and home units, NSEC and the dean, etc.) and the announcement of the outcomes took WAY too long.

### Comment 3

Since the hiring is done by the units, it seems contradictory to have the graduate groups make the requests. My suggestion would be that the units make the requests, and that these requests should include some evidence that at least one graduate group is supportive of the request.

### Comment 4

Some MCB faculty members would prefer to have FTE requests come from bylaw units, rather than graduate groups.

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



---

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED  
5200 N. LAKE RD. BUILDING A  
MERCED, CA 95343  
(209) 228-7839  
FAX (209) 228-4007

## 2013-2014 SSHA Executive Committee

## Memorandum

To: CAPRA

Date: 10-31-2013

Re: Request for input on the FTE process from CAPRA

The SSHA Executive Committee made the following suggestions regarding the FTE process:

- The strategic focus of this process should coincide with that of the University's forthcoming strategic plan. While the plan may not be completed by the time an FTE call is made this year, CAPRA should consult with the office of the Provost about how to best insure some sort of alignment.
- Both the FTE requests and the hiring should be coordinated by the Bylaw Unit that will make the hire in consultation with the corresponding graduate group. This is different than last year where it was primarily the duty of the graduate groups to coordinate and develop FTE proposals.
- Endorsements did little to add to the process last year and they were inherently uninformative. This requirement also caused some confusion, stress and competition. For these and other reasons, SSHA did not give much of any weight to endorsements when making its' rankings.
- Although making proposals publically available made it easier to organize collaborative hires, there was not enough time to coordinate any serious efforts towards revisions and joint planning. In order to avoid confusion, the Dean should be more involved in the Executive Committee discussions on FTE rankings, perhaps by conversing with the committee during their initial discussion. While the Dean has the ultimate authority to prioritize hires, the Executive Committee may have been able to provide additional information to the Dean that would have been helpful in his decision making.
- Having a unified university and school vision and strategic plan will make FTE proposals from units easier in the future.

## **School of Engineering Executive Committee Comments**

**Received Monday, November 4, 2013**

### Comment 1

(1) Whereas it makes sense to focus on graduate groups and research agendas, bylaw units need to be intimately involved in the process, not as an after thought but as a partner. Though this may be seem less true for SoE, which is a single bylaw unit, the process should aim at units and graduate groups making joint proposals, rather than graduate groups making proposals that are evaluated, supported, or prioritized by the units.

(2) There was a decided lack of clarity on evaluation criteria and process overall. It makes little sense for groups to evaluate their own and one another's proposals, and for units and groups to write statements supporting one another. Last year seemed to be a big game of "support mine and I'll support yours". And there was no way to know how things were being evaluated at higher levels.

(3) The campus -- at the dean and provost level -- have to set some priorities for growth up front. Otherwise you get the same old thing in the end: everyone gets one new line, impacted majors maybe get more, and certain pet projects of the deans may also get more.

### Comment 2

- It wasn't useful for groups to evaluate their own positions (the score column on the CAPRA Criteria Rating Sheet). There was no reason not to rank them high.
- It was difficult in the SoE for the EC to rank the proposals from the many graduate groups that had proposed positions. The programs vary so much that trying to rank positions between groups was like comparing apples and oranges. In the end, we could only rank positions within a group and then use a round-robin approach to rank them overall. This was challenging also because, even though all groups had representation on the EC, not all of the members participated. We were not able to get direct input from groups through their EC members but had to rely on the proposals.

### Comment 3

One comment that I would like to propose is to have, as last year, the CAPRA chair come to one of our full faculty meetings to explain how the process will be and answer any questions.

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

---

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



---

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR  
[senatechair@ucmerced.edu](mailto:senatechair@ucmerced.edu)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED  
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD  
MERCED, CA 95343  
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

**October 30, 2013**

## **Standing Committee Chairs**

## **School Executive Committee Chairs**

**Re: Campus Issues of Diversity**

The Faculty Welfare, Diversity, & Academic Freedom committee (FWDAF) believes that the diversity of our campus's faculty could be a great strength, and that our campus would be better situated to achieve its goals by enhancing its diversity among faculty and graduate students. Growing and preserving that diversity is an essential component in serving UC Merced's student population, which is the most ethnically diverse in the UC system. Diversity is a specific mission of the UC system. To address this issue, Provost/EVC Peterson has requested Senate and School Executive committees to consider opportunities to advance campus diversity. Senate and School Executive committees are requested to answer the following questions in their consideration of diversity:

1. How can we enhance ethnic and gender diversity among the faculty and graduate students on our campus?
2. What kind of leadership efforts should be made to ensure a commitment to diversity?
3. How do we attract and retain diverse faculty and graduate students?
4. What are the committee's concerns, if any, about diversity practices and what are your recommendations for improvement?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ignacio López-Calvo".

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair  
Division Council

cc: Senate Office

## CAPRA Comments on Diversity Memo

### Comment 1

I believe that all individuals deserve to be treated as individuals, and not as members of any group that they did not make a conscious choice to join. In an academic setting, each person should be judged on his or her intellectual ability, scholarly productivity and creativity, educational effectiveness, and ethical standards. No person should be advantaged or disadvantaged based on gender, color of skin, national origin of ancestors, or any other such condition of birth. To do so is simply unjust to the individual.

The questions posed in Ignacio's letter presume that we want to achieve something that I do not think should be a goal. I do not think that the gender and ethnic diversity of the faculty bears any relationship to its quality. The question we should be asking is how can we hire the most talented scholars available, and how can we give them what they need to be maximally creative and productive. Similar considerations apply to our graduate student population.