

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

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

9:00 – 10:30 am

KL 362

I. Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF) Committee members

Discussion. SAF committee members Jeff Gilger and Arnold Kim to provide updates to CAPRA members on SAF. The SAF committee's first fall semester meeting is scheduled for September 19.

II. Consent Calendar

Pg. 1-4

Action requested: Approval of minutes from September 10 meeting.

III. Campus Space Planning and Prioritization

Pg. 5

Action requested: CAPRA members to develop principles of space planning and prioritization based on a committee member's prior communication to senior administrative leadership. The principles are intended for distribution to the Provost/EVC.

IV. Provost/EVC Forum for Faculty and Lecturers

The Provost/EVC is holding a forum for all Senate faculty and Unit 18 lecturers on September 24 from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in SSB 160. Attendees were encouraged to submit questions [here](#) prior to the forum. A CAPRA member has submitted a question on behalf of the committee.

V. Campus Review Item

Pg. 6-8

Economics PhD Proposal.

Prior to this meeting, two CAPRA members took the lead on reviewing the proposal for the committee.

Action requested: CAPRA to discuss the reviews and vote whether to recommend that the proposal move forward.

Proposal and CAPRA reviews can be viewed at
UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources/Review Items – Campus

VI. Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 10, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on September 10, 2014 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley provided an update from the September 3 Division Council meeting where main topics of discussion included space and parking.

II. Continuing Business from AY 13-14

In May 2014, CAPRA submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC with a request for a listing of faculty lines that were allocated last year and a list of all lines that were allocated in previous years. CAPRA's intention was to formulate a tracking system to better plan for future FTE allocations. The Provost/EVC has not yet sent a response.

ACTION: CAPRA to follow up with the Provost/EVC on last year's faculty lines.

The Provost/EVC is holding an all faculty and lecturer forum on September 24. Faculty are encouraged to submit questions beforehand via a website established by the Provost's office. CAPRA members decided to submit a question on behalf of the committee: is there a contingency plan if nobody submits an acceptable bid for academic space under Project 2020?

ACTION: A CAPRA member will submit the contingency plan question to the website for the all faculty forum.

III. Goals for AY 14-15

CAPRA set two overarching goals for this academic year. One is the folding of the traditional FTE allocation request process into the Provost's Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAF). The Provost met with CAPRA members

this summer and indicated that the SAFI process would be finalized by the end of this calendar year. If this deadline is met, then CAPRA could disseminate its criteria for the evaluation of FTE requests at this time in time for spring semester reviews. However, if SAFI's work is delayed, then faculty lines may not be allocated in a timely manner again, thus affecting strategic planning and faculty recruitment.

ACTION: As the Provost is not available until December to attend a CAPRA meeting, CAPRA will invite members of the SAFI committee to provide their faculty perspective on the strategic planning process.

ACTION: CAPRA to ascertain the SAFI fall semester meeting schedule and confirm the membership. A CAPRA member has been asked to serve as a replacement for a former SAFI member but this has not yet been confirmed. If the CAPRA member is approved to serve on SAFI, then he will provide updates to CAPRA through the academic year.

The other main goal CAPRA identified this year is space planning and prioritization. Graduate students have minimal lab and office space to conduct their work. UCM cannot grow its graduate programs or recruit quality graduate students due to the pressing space needs. The transition from SE 1 to SE 2 has not gone smoothly and faculty remain gravely concerned about the space situation both on campus and Castle. Faculty members' success with grants is being negatively affected when they cannot prove an adequate research infrastructure.

CAPRA members discussed the idea of formulating principles of space allocation to provide to the Provost. These principles would be based on a communication that a CAPRA member wrote to colleagues in her School. Essentially, it must be made clear that the priorities for space allocation on campus should be: faculty, research staff such as post docs, teaching faculty such as lecturers, students, and finally, staff. Student advisors should remain on campus due to their regular, face-to-face contact with students, but most other administrative staff should be relocated off campus.

CAPRA members held a lengthy discussion on who has the authority to assign academic space and what are the principles for assigning space to Schools/faculty/research units. The Campus Physical Planning Committee does not have the authority to allocate space. The main space issues are 1) planning for future space in conjunction with Project 2020 and whether faculty will have adequate input. OP's capital budget is small and provides sizeable funds for seismic retrofitting which does not affect UCM at this time. 2) how to prioritize the allocation of current space. In addition to the immediate problem of no space for graduate student and inadequate space for faculty, there is no articulation or formulized framework on how space is assigned to ORUs and other research units. There is no indication of how the campus will function with being overprescribed on space now and the lack of sufficient planning for the future. As such, it will be extremely difficult for the campus to meet the enrollment projections that are established for the next three years. Perhaps an external entity, one that has no vested interest in the outcome, should conduct a space audit on campus.

ACTION: CAPRA to draft a memo to the Provost stating a set of principles for space allocation.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF) submitted a memo to CAPRA suggesting the convening of a joint committee on an interim basis to focus on academic space issues. CAPRA agreed that, as part of their employment, faculty have the right of adequate space for research. However, CAPRA is not in favor of creating another committee; rather, we should focus how ways to better engage the Provost. Perhaps the Chairs of FWDAF and CAPRA could hold their own meeting with the Provost.

ACTION: CAPRA to respond to FWDAF and suggest that FWDAF develop a communication to the Provost about space and faculty rights.

IV. Campus Review Items

Senate-IT Administration IT Advisory Council draft charge. CAPRA members pointed out that the charge should include a point about the need for the administration to seek consultation from the faculty on expensive software subscriptions that affect faculty and students. Faculty's needs should be investigated and input sought prior to any long term campus investment in such hardware and software.

ACTION: CAPRA will draft a response to the Senate Chair.

Economics PhD proposal. CAPRA identified two members to review the proposal.

ACTION: The two reviewers will circulate their reviews to the committee via email for discussion at the September 24 CAPRA meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

Communication from a CAPRA member

- People are, in general, unhappy about the spaces that they have now or will get in the near future.
- The problem is here to stay for at least another 5 years, with little relief in sight.
- There is not enough space on campus for faculty, students, research staff, postdocs **AND** administrators.

The division of SE building 1 and 2 between SNS and SoE has been fraught with problems from the get go. The design of SE 2 doesn't match the needs of the Schools very well, the current faculty, and future research efforts. It is a beautiful looking building with limited usefulness. In my opinion, there are some guidelines from a faculty/student/research perspective that are most important.

- **All** faculty should have offices and Laboratories on the main campus. **No exceptions to this.**
- Postdocs and research staff need proper office spaces. They do the main body of research. Without them, we are not a proper Research I university.
- Graduate students are not cattle and they should not be warehoused in cubicle farms. They are precious resources and need proper space for them to carry out serious intellectual work.
- Administrators who do not need to interact with students or faculty in person should be located off campus: Castle, Promenade, Mondo, the new offices on G Street.
Convenience for day to day operations should not trump research and education.
- Administrators that meet with students could have offices on campus, but not in SE 1 or SE 2, which should be kept for faculty, researchers, and grad students first. AOA, COB, SSB, SSM, and off campus are alternatives.

Other ideas for maximization of space include some of the following:

- Storage space for field equipment, broken equipment, unused equipment, unused technology should be removed from labs and kept at Castle or another location. Nothing is more frustrating than to see high quality lab space warehousing items that take up valuable space.
- Designing labs by scientific groups, not random assignments, should be done by function as much as possible. For example, organic chemists should be co-located, as well as genomics faculty. Current faculty in SE1 may need to move to make this possible.
- By-law units should be given the prerogative to manage their own lab and office spaces. As an individual faculty members research waxes or wanes, adjustments should be made.
- Convert conference rooms in SE1 and SE2 to office spaces for postdocs, research staff, and graduate students, or even dry lab spaces for faculty.

The idea of keeping faculty at Castle or in a building off G Street makes no sense given that we are trying to build a competitive Research I University. There is very little that can replace the human interactions in this experience: faculty to faculty; student to faculty; research staff to student.

CAPRA review of Economics graduate group proposal

This is a proposal to initiate a graduate program in Economics. It is a new program not originating as an IGP emphasis. The program identifies eight ladder rank faculty (including one arriving in January 2015) as core economics faculty and ten additional faculty who qualify as affiliate members. The proposal is to admit about ten students in 2016, skip a year, admit another ten in 2018, skip another year, and then begin admitting about ten per year on an annual basis. This seems a bit odd from the standpoint of program continuity but it probably does facilitate offering the required graduate courses with a small faculty at the outset.

Relative to most graduate programs, Economics requires relatively few resources in terms of space and infrastructure. The main resource requirement is graduate student support. Table 1 lists projected economics TA needs based on projected numbers of students in the Economics and Management and Business Economics majors and shows that it should be possible to support essentially all of the students in the program with TAs. However, these numbers are “based on UC guidelines of one 50% TAship for each 22 undergraduate students”. The number of TAs required depends on the types of courses offered in the major and the campus policy for TA workload. Since both of these majors currently exist, wouldn't a better estimate of TA needs be obtained by looking at how many TAs are currently required to serve the existing student population in these majors and then simply scaling the numbers? I would certainly hope that some of the Economics graduate students would be supported by faculty research grants, although the proposal, perhaps wisely, does not rely on that. The proposal also notes that two additional labs and additional graduate student workspace will be required to administer this program. It is not clear where this space will be found. However, any new or growing graduate program will require some additional space and the needs of this program are relatively modest.

The other main resource requirement is faculty time to offer the graduate courses. Page 39 of the proposal refers to “the normal Economics teaching load of one undergraduate courses (*sic*) per year and one graduate course per year”. Since UC Merced does not yet have a graduate program in Economics, “normal” in this context presumably refers to the norm at other research universities. It is not clear to me whether having the Economics faculty doing half their teaching in the graduate program will excessively impact the existing undergraduate programs in Economics and Management. Apparently this is not viewed as a major problem since the SSHA Dean has approved the proposal.

I also note that the creation of the graduate program in Economics is expected to be accompanied by the creation of a new Economics bylaw unit. While it is certainly possible to run a graduate program that draws its core faculty either from multiple bylaw units or from a subset of the faculty of a large bylaw unit, in a well defined discipline such as economics it makes sense for the two to overlap such that they emulate a normal department as much as possible.

There is one error that should be corrected before the proposal moves on. Page 4 lists current graduate programs but omits several including Physics and Chemistry & Chemical Biology. The proposal should either list all of the existing programs or else name only those with which it expects to have particular synergy.

Economics PhD Program Proposal Review

Overall this is a proposal for a well-needed graduate program that will benefit UC Merced. It is imperative that UC Merced build out PhD programs to achieve the status as a true research university. It is eminently reasonable that this include a PhD program in Economics given the faculty already on board and expected demands and opportunities. The four areas selected as the foci of the program appear good, matching faculty expertise, growth potential, synergies on campus, and regional needs. On the whole, I am supportive of the development of this PhD program.

However, there are some concerns with the proposal as it currently stands relevant to academic planning and resource allocation.

Whereas this program can start with current faculty of 8 (expected January 2015), much like was achieved for example with Psychological Sciences and being proposed for Sociology and Political Sciences, the projections for growth to 16 by 2020 appear vastly optimistic given known faculty allocation plans. First, to my knowledge there is no recruitment during the current AY for new Economics faculty to start AY 2015/16. Therefore, acquiring 3 new lines to recruit to start AY 2016/17, as projected in this proposal, appears quite unreasonable.

Further, basing faculty line allocations on past processes seems not at all useful given the Strategic Academic Focusing process to be implemented for the rest of the decade. Whether Economics will be the beneficiary of additional resources from SAF is unknown at present. If not, it appears unlikely Economics, or any non-selected disciplines, will have a growth of 1 faculty per year. Economics would do well to project a future based on the possibility that the allocation may be less, quite possibly markedly less, than the projected more than 1 per year. Indeed the Dean's letter states this caveat to the projections inherent in this proposal. At the same time, the program can be quite viable without the overly optimistic projected faculty growth. It would do well to reflect this ability to leave no doubt about that.

Further to the projected growth of faculty, the desired size of the faculty is in part defended as the smallest in the UC system. The proposal makes the point that the projected size in 2020 will still be 2 less than the next largest program in the UC, that being UCR. However, UCR has an UG enrollment currently over 18,000, which is about 2 times larger than UCM projected UG enrollment in 2020. It can therefore generate a much larger credit production that supports its faculty size in Economics. This comparison to UCR (or any other UC campus) appears not to be reasonable.

Another concern is the quite low projected number of graduate students that will be enrolled in the Economics PhD program given the projected faculty. The proposal states as the aim about 2 graduate students per faculty. This is despite assertions that PhD training in Economics remains popular throughout the UC System as well as nationwide. Given the need at UC Merced to grow graduate student enrollment to 10% by 2020, and to increase the awarding of PhDs, all approved programs will need to contribute substantially more than this program projects, on the order of 3-4 per faculty. Or is there some unique argument that research training in Economics is so demanding on faculty that they can only supervise two graduate students at any one time?

The frequency of course offerings lists most courses as "annual." But given the enrollment of students every two years for most of this decade, this seems not to represent reality. Furthermore some courses are listed as every 2-3 years. Yet it seems impossible for students to meet their major and minor requirements in a timely manner, as suggested in the sample curriculum plan, if courses are offered any less than every 2 years. The table of Sample Teaching Grid moreover is based on assumptions that do

not correspond well to previous descriptions of planned roll out of program over the next 5 years. The various resource-related plans in this proposal need to be internally consistent and based on the same assumptions.

It is unclear how ECON 209 (Math for Economists) will be offered exactly. It states that students will enroll prior to the Fall semester, which seems unusual. What resource implications will this unusual arrangement have? For example, will this require payment to faculty to teach outside of regular semester?

The new CAO building is described to be open in fall 2015, but it is not scheduled to open until fall 2016.

The reliance on NRT support needs further elaboration given the expected enrollment of 50% international students.