

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2012-2013

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning (CAPRA) held a total of 14 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.IV.1](#).

The 2012-2013 academic year was a transition year in terms of a new budget and planning process. CAPRA was at the center of this process and worked closely with the Provost and Schools to help guide the campus through a new way of thinking about the budget. While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on the transitional process of obtaining FTE allocations from the Schools and the subsequent consultation with the Provost.

Framework for FTE Requests

At the beginning of the academic year, CAPRA discussed considerations for establishing a new framework for making faculty FTE requests. In the past FTE requests were mainly driven by undergraduate teaching needs, which is not generally characteristic of a major research university and especially not characteristic of a university striving to obtain that status. CAPRA strongly supported giving graduate and research groups the opportunity to submit FTE requests. The committee also felt that the request process may be more effective and successful if the Schools and campus first look at where they expect to be in 2020 and use that as a guiding principle.

The process for the 2012-2013 year represented a "way station" to a more robust and connected planning process. Next year, we expect CAPRA and the administration will be asking Schools to present a strategic plan that outlines what they expect to look like when we reach 10,000/10% graduate students in 2020, including their space needs and "brand" research and graduate programs. In 2012-2013, though, there were two major changes to the FTE request process:

1. Rather than a total number of FTEs, the Chancellor allocated a maximum dollar amount for FTEs (including start up) across all Schools.

2. CAPRA responded to the Chancellor's focus on developing the graduate and research mission of the university by asking that FTE requests, as are part of the Dean's overall budget requests, to represent the priorities of the twelve existing graduate programs. The requests were submitted through the lead Dean for the program.

While CAPRA did not request full strategic plans this year, the committee did ask the Schools to provide 1) a brief overview of how each graduate group sees its trajectory, and how they see themselves connecting to research in other parts of the campus; 2) a brief overview of the metrics that may be useful in assessing the success of the program, and 3) a 2 year FTE request. Academic units, ORUs, and CRUs were also permitted to submit a hiring request under the auspices of one or more graduate groups.

At the end of the year, CAPRA, in consultation with the Provost, came to the following conclusions about the new FTE allocation process:

The campus did not wholly succeed in evaluating plans and goals. While graduate groups all wrote plans, neither the School Executive Committees (ECs) nor the Deans assessed them. Instead, they assessed individual positions. A key piece to strategic planning of any kind is to separate the evaluation and assessment of plans from the assignment of particular FTEs. A focus on the plans, without the positions, would have allowed CAPRA to help develop a campus, rather than a School, academic plan

Unresolved issues/lessons learned from the 2012-2013 transitional process:

- Replacement faculty FTEs. In SNS, they were ranked along with new positions, as if in competition; the SSHA position identified as a replacement position by the EC was not ranked by the Dean. CAPRA looks forward to a future coherent process to handle these FTEs.
- LPSOE positions. The campus needs some consensus on the positions. In SNS, the Dean did not recommend an SOE position that would serve the campus' largest and most impacted major. The SSHA Dean recommended one of four requested SOEs, but gave no reason for not including others. CAPRA points to these unanswered questions: What are our criteria for SOEs? How do we rank

them? Should they be listed in with ladder faculty positions? If separately (as seems logical), what are the criteria?

- Start-up. While CAPRA was asked to think about the question of FTE requests without associating it with budget, clearly each Schools' requests have been shaped by historical allocations, which have in turn been shaped by financial considerations. Next year, it would be helpful if the budget included an item for start-up so it is not treated as a new budget item each year. The campus will need start-up funds from somewhere (not necessarily identified) for the foreseeable future. CAPRA looks forward to a process that includes answers to such dilemmas as the total cost of hiring faculty is and what kind of support is needed.

CAPRA Criteria:

In terms of the CAPRA criteria, and the School process, CAPRA made the following observations:

- There was a lack of consultation and dialogue between the School ECs and the Deans on the Dean's final recommendations, at least in two of the Schools. Next year's CAPRA should ensure that the ECs have the opportunity to endorse or comment on the Deans proposals.
- There was a lack of cross-school collaboration partly due to the timeline and partly due to the state of mind in the Schools. There seemed to be no carrots for collaboration.
- Similarly, there is inconsistent thinking about "interdisciplinary" proposals. Thus a position which asks for a particular non-disciplinary slant on a subject may be judged as interdisciplinary, while two connected positions that would speak to each other are seen as disciplinary. This is a particular issue for the graduate groups that incorporate multiple disciplines: they are attentive to both the need to disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary coherence.
- The School ECs and Deans did not comment on the trajectories for growth that were put forth by the graduate groups. The focus was entirely on the positions.
- Neither School ECs nor Deans provided significant guidance in assessing the claims made by groups in the FTE requests.
- While the Deans of SNS and SSHA both explained why each *position* was

chosen, their larger framework for making decisions was less clear. The lack of clear consultation with the School ECs hampered the articulation of an overarching school vision.

CAPRA also opined on the following issues:

State Budget

Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot successfully passed and will provide the UC with an additional \$125.7M in enrollment support.

Urban Land Institute

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) was hired to assist the campus in finding solutions for physical expansion behind the original campus footprint. ULI visited campus in September 2012 and took an in-depth look at capital development and funding options. A final report from ULI was released in spring 2013 via Chancellor Leland, detailing the measures that must be undertaken to achieve Project 2020/10,000. The Chancellor has indicated her intention to carry out the ULI report recommendations by soliciting public private partnerships for building a cluster of academic and non-academic buildings. It is vital that the faculty be fully engaged in identifying the key space needs associated with academic program growth for undergraduate instruction, graduate training, and research at 2020/10,000 students/10% graduate students.

Academic Planning and Space

In March 2013, CAPRA proposed that DivCo recommend to the Chancellor that a Senate-Administration Committee of 6-8 people (3-4 faculty, 3-4 administration) be formed to gather information and determine the kinds of academic space needed to serve anticipated growth of academic programs. The committee would identify and synthesize the kinds of teaching and research space we will need at 2-3 times our current faculty size, double the number of undergraduate students, and triple the number of graduate students. In particular, the committee would identify the amount of specific types of space (e.g., wet research labs, core research facilities, teaching labs of various kinds, studios, performance space, graduate student space) aligned with academic program growth. Although program growth cannot be completely defined at this point, especially for new programs, the contours of the growth of existing and

incipient graduate and undergraduate programs over the next seven years can be generally planned and aligned with space requirements.

The committee should continue to be engaged as appropriate as discussions move forward. The committee would need support from either the office of the Provost or the VCPB.

The Provost also expressed his wish to meet with each School Dean to review faculty hiring plans in conjunction with available space. CAPRA thought this would assist in its review of budget/resource/FTE requests.

Development

CAPRA conveyed its concern to the Provost that the campus lacks a transparent vision and mission for increasing development revenue. The committee agreed that a stronger and more strategic effort should be made to attract donor funds and that the faculty should be included in the process. A new Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Affairs was hired to coordinate this effort. At the Provost's request, CAPRA discussed the development issue with the Chancellor and emphasized the need for donors to interact with faculty members who can best communicate academic and research activities in light of shared interests and goals.

Systemwide Review Items

- Proposed revision of financial aid formula. The committee was particularly cognizant of the interests of students as it considered the three options presented by the systemwide UC. CAPRA acknowledged the strengths and drawbacks of each proposal, but in the end, the committee decided that "Option A" (fund self-help at the midpoint of the current benchmark manageable range) is the best of the three. It combines a predictable level of aid and manageable debt expectations.
- Open Access policy. CAPRA carefully reviewed the proposed Open Access Policy. The policy would expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work. CAPRA agreed that it carried no

significant direct resource implications, though it may have implications for grants.

- **Rebenching project.** CAPRA discussed the systemwide reports on the rebenching project and enrollment management. While UC Merced will not participate in the rebenching implementation, it will eventually be folded into the system. In response to the reports and with consideration for UC Merced's future, the committee's comments fell into three broad categories; (1) the systemwide rebenching model; (2) Merced's integration into the process; and (3) campus-level considerations. The committee noted the following: Rebenching should not be implemented without a predefined enrollment management plan. The two prominent risks of failing to do so are (1) that some campuses may attempt to significantly increase in-state enrollment numbers and (2) that some campuses may push for increased out-of-state enrollment numbers. Both of these scenarios would have a negative impact on the University's historic mission of ensuring quality, access, and affordability in its education.

In the course of its discussion of rebenching and enrollment management, CAPRA agreed that in addition to the campus' discussion on a systemwide enrollment management plan, a similar discussion is warranted at the local level. Merced needs to be strategic in how it plans to reach its 2020 goals, and enrollment management is a critical variable in this regard.

Campus Review Items

- **Life and Environmental Sciences (LES) Bylaw 55 Unit proposal.** CAPRA informed the Senate chair that the proposal contained no significant resource implications.
- **Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Political Science.** CAPRA focused primarily on the resource implications of the proposal. The committee's greatest concern was that the proposal did not show how the program can be offered with current resources. The proposal also assumes that Political Science will receive "one or two" FTEs each year; however, we cannot predict their success in the planning process. As the Chancellor pays increasing attention to strategic planning, the parameters driving FTE allocations will change. CAPRA would like to see a realistic course rotation (incorporating leaves as well as undergraduate and

graduate teaching responsibilities), in order to show that the program is feasible with current resources.

- Draft 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation. CAPRA is particularly concerned with the cost implications of this process, and the challenge of establishing appropriate benchmarks. While the accreditation process itself may be simpler, the cost in both time and money of the assessment processes that WASC is mandating will be a significant burden on the campus.

Respectfully submitted:

CAPRA members

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA) – UCPB representative

Matt Meyer, Vice Chair (SNS)

Marcelo Kallmann, (SoE)

Ignacio López-Calvo, Senate Vice Chair (SSHA)

Ruth Mostern, (SSHA)

Teamrat Ghezzehei, (SNS) – Fall term

Jay Sharping (SNS) – Spring term

Ex officio, non-voting members:

Peggy O'Day, Senate Chair (SNS)

Student Representatives:

Jason Baumsteiger, Graduate Student Representative

David Ascencio, Undergraduate Student Representative

Staff:

Fatima Paul

Mary Ann Coughlin