

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)**Wednesday, December 3, 2014****9:00 – 10:00 am****KL 362****[UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources](#)****I. Chair's Report – Anne Kelley**

Updates from December 2 UCPB meeting

II. Consent Calendar**Pg. 1-3****Action requested:** approval of minutes from November 19 meeting**III. Revised FTE Allocation Process****Pg. 4-7**

Background: In the last academic year, CAPRA prepared a process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests in expectation of reviewing FTE proposals in spring 2014. The Provost/EVC approved the document. However, the traditional call for FTE requests did not occur due to the implementation of the new strategic academic focusing process. Pursuant to CAPRA's memo to the Provost/EVC on November 21 requesting the release of disciplinary FTE lines, CAPRA chair has revised the criteria for evaluation of FTE requests.

Action requested: CAPRA members to review and approve the revised process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests.

IV. Total Remuneration Study**Pg. 8-11**

Background: The Academic Council Chair and Systemwide Provost have requested that the four systemwide committees corresponding to local committees of CAP, CAPRA, and FWDAF review the total remuneration study and draft recommendations for the faculty salary gap.

Remuneration study and relevant communication are available at [UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources/UCPB/Remuneration Study](#)

Action: CAPRA members to review the remuneration report and provide recommendations. Recommendations will be transmitted to the UCPB chair.

V. Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
November 19, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on November 19, 2014 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

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

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley and committee member Wallander updated the CAPRA members on the November 14 Meeting of the Division. At the meeting, Provost/EVC Peterson discussed the strategic academic focusing process and Vice Provost for Faculty's (VPF) Camfield's recent memo to all faculty on facilitated discussions to narrow down the five, broad, thematic research areas. Some faculty members in attendance responded to the Provost/EVC that he has the information he needs and suggested that he should make a decision on the themes now. These faculty members expressed concern with the timeline and that FTE lines will not be released in time for next year's hiring if these facilitated discussions proceed. Another faculty member in attendance voiced support for the facilitated discussions.

II. Consent Calendar

The November 5 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. VPF's Memo on Strategic Academic Focusing

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed the memo that was sent to all faculty from VPF Camfield. CAPRA members drafted a response memo asking the Provost/EVC to release a subset of FTE lines now for the foundational/disciplinary areas so that next year's hiring is not negatively impacted. Faculty are concerned that the strategic academic focusing process will not conclude in a timely manner for an effective FTE allocation process to occur. The draft memo also included CAPRA's suggestion that the

Provost/EVC make a decision on the five broad, thematic research areas as he should already be in possession of all the information required.

CAPRA drafted a similar memo to members of the strategic academic focusing committee and the VPF to inform them that CAPRA is making the aforementioned suggestions to the Provost/EVC.

CAPRA members debated the language of the memo to the Provost/EVC, as a minority of the committee felt that due to the broad nature of many of the strategic academic focusing proposals and the significant resource implications, the Provost/EVC should proceed with consulting additional groups of faculty. A majority of the committee felt that the Provost/EVC has all the information required and should make a decision on the narrowing of the five broad, thematic research areas.

CAPRA members agreed on the following language to include in the memo to the Provost/EVC: suggest a binary choice to either 1) make the decision now on the five thematic research areas and release FTE lines for both the disciplinary/foundational and strategic areas for search next year; or 2) postpone assigning faculty lines associated with the strategic academic focusing process for one year to allow faculty to generate the information requested in the VPF's memo, and release FTE lines only for the disciplinary/foundational areas. CAPRA will revise the criteria it developed last year for FTE requests for the disciplinary hires.

IV. Space Principles

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed all Senate committee and school executive committee comments and revised the space principles accordingly.

ACTION: Send space principles to the Provost/EVC, school deans, school executive committee chairs, Division Council, Tom Lollini, campus architect; Steve Rabedaux, Director of Academic Facilities Planning; Jeffrey Gilger, faculty representative on the Campus Physical Planning Committee; Phillip

Woods, Director of Physical & Environmental Planning; Abigail Rider, AVC of Real Estate; Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research; Marjorie Zatz, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Education, and Graeme Mitchell, AVC of Strategic Facilities Planning.

V. FTE Tracking

Near the end of the last academic year, CAPRA requested from the Provost/EVC a list of all new faculty lines originally allocated for search at the start of the current academic year, and a corresponding list of all other new faculty lines that were approved through special mechanisms after the original allocation was made. CAPRA requested this information for purposes of improved strategic planning and to assist the Provost/EVC in making the most efficient use of limited resources to meet increasing demands.

The Provost/EVC responded earlier this fall semester with the requested information. CAPRA members reviewed and discussed the information provided.

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

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

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) and the Provost's office (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 |
|------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

November 25, 2014

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS
DIVISIONAL CHAIRS
UCAAD MEMBERS
UCAP MEMBERS
UCFW MEMBERS
UCPB MEMBERS

Dear Colleagues:

We are writing to ask that all of you participate in a process that is intended to provide administrators and faculty the opportunity to share information and perspectives about goals, cost-benefit trade-offs, and desired options for setting faculty salary for FY 2015-16. As detailed at the end of this letter, we are requesting that a campus meeting about faculty salary take place before the winter break – the sooner the better.

UC's 3-Year Sustainability Plan, which is required by the Legislature, was submitted to the Regents November 19, 2014. With respect to compensation increases, it included the following (p. 4):

The financial plan assumes modest compensation increases over the next three years equivalent to 3% each year for all staff, including represented and non-represented academic and non-academic staff. The latest faculty compensation study concluded that UC's faculty salaries are nearly 12% behind market. In the past, the University has been able to hire and retain faculty in part because of the strong benefit packages the University has offered, even as the University's comparative salary position has slipped. As the University has reduced the value of its benefit offerings, the salary lag becomes a bigger obstacle in the University's efforts to recruit and retain top talent. The proposed compensation increases are not expected to close UC's salary lag but to keep UC salaries from slipping further behind those of UC's principal competitor institutions.

Ultimately the President decides the amount of any compensation increase, options for using it, and how it does or does not fit into a long-term plan to bring compensation to competitive levels. President Napolitano will definitely consult with the Chancellors, and she will want to know what the Senate and the Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts think. Because the two of us will be the ones to convey that information, we want to do all we can to ensure that preferences and the reasons for them are understood. If possible, we hope to present one or a limited number of preferred choices that are available and widely acceptable. We expect there can be differences among campuses and between faculty and administration, and we want to do our best to find mutually satisfactory options for all concerned.

We are beginning a process that we believe may help us with the recommendations. This process includes work by 1) the four identified systemwide Senate committees (UCAAD, UCAP, UCFW, UCPB), 2) a Senate workgroup consisting of one representative from each of these four committees, 3) a joint workgroup of these four Senate representatives and four campus administrators, and 4) consultation with both the Academic Council and the COVC.

Here is our request for now. As discussed at the last COVC meeting and subsequently between the two of us and Dan Hare, we are asking that each Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, before winter break (and the sooner the better), convene a campus meeting to discuss options, opportunities and constraints, and campus preferences from both the administrative and Senate perspectives. At a minimum, meetings should include the Divisional Chair and your campus members of the four systemwide committees noted above. Each campus may determine whether to include other administrators or Senate leaders. Please share whatever information is helpful, whether from campus administration, campus committees, and/or UCOP.

Please consider options both for starting to address in FY 2015-16 the full salary lags noted in the Total Remuneration study (<http://compensation.universityofcalifornia.edu/total-remuneration-ladder-rank-faculty-2014.pdf>) and also for implementing a “regular” 3% increase in FY 2015-16. The goal of the campus meeting is to share information and perspectives, not to achieve consensus, although that would be a welcome outcome.

Academic Personnel and Programs and Institutional Research and Academic Planning are in the middle of developing a data set that addresses such topics as off-scales by discipline and campus, costs of various increases, and the like. It should be ready the week of December 8 and will be shared with everyone when available. Our understanding of the purposes of the meeting we are requesting leads us to say that the data package is not necessary in order to have a very productive campus conversation, but you will know best.

Thank you in advance for your efforts. We hope this collaborative step will assist us in developing the best possible recommendations for faculty salary enhancements in FY 2015-16.

Cordially,



Mary Gilly, Chair
Academic Council



Aimée Dorr, Provost
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

- cc: Vice Chair Hare
- Vice Provost Carlson
- Vice President Brown
- Executive Director Baxter
- Chief of Staff Jones
- Executive Directors, Divisional Senate
- Executive Assistants to EVC/Ps
- Principal Analyst Abrams
- Principal Analyst Feer
- Principal Analyst Harms



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
Joel Dimsdale, Chair
jdimsdale@ucsd.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

November 21, 2014

JEFFREY KNAPP, UCAP CHAIR
GARY LEAL, UCPB CHAIR
DAVID LOPEZ-CARR, UCAAD CHAIR

RE: Total Remuneration

Dear Colleagues,

As you know, our four committees have been tasked by the Academic Council to develop principles and recommendations for redressing the total remuneration gap identified by the recently completed study. UCFW has been discussing this topic consistently over the last few years, and we discussed it again at our November meeting. At that time, we developed the attached list of principles to inform specific plans of action. Please confer with your committees and let us know your opinions.

Since our deadline is December 15, may I propose that we meet by teleconference during the UCFW meeting of December 12 to discuss your committees' feedback and next steps.

I look forward to collaborating with you on this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joel E. Dimsdale".

Joel E. Dimsdale, UCFW Chair

Encl.

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Brenda Abrams, UCAP Analyst
Fredye Harms, UCAAD Analyst
Kenneth Feer, UCPB Analyst

UCFW DRAFT propositions regarding Total Rem
11/20/14

I have arranged the committee's comments in declining order of importance. i.e. the committee was strongly supportive of the top 5 recommendations. There was interest in the subsequent 6 recommendations as well, but the committee felt that these matters needed further discussion.

1. Our total remuneration is now below the comparison 8 average. This must not be allowed to deteriorate further. Aiming for the "average of the Comparison 8" is not the path to maintaining excellence.
2. The focus should be on total rem, rather than salary OR benefits.
3. There must be no further deterioration of benefits, either in terms of costs to employees (including out of pocket costs) or extent of coverage. This implies that correcting the total REM situation is best addressed by focusing on cash compensation (i.e. salaries)
4. While one can discuss other models, the easiest short-term solution would be a multi-year across-the-board range adjustment increase in faculty salaries. 3%/year for 3 successive years would forestall any worsening of our position vis a vis the comparison 8 but would not correct the situation. UCOP estimates are that it would take 7.4% increases for each of 3 years or 5.6% increases over 5 years to close the gap with the Comp 8 average.
5. As stated by the senate on multiple previous occasions, rather than embarking on well-intentioned new programs, the university should focus its energy and resources on strengthening the fundamental faculty infrastructure and staff support. As we anticipate the future needs of the university as well as the State of California, a "reinvestment in quality" must begin with the faculty.

6. Continue to emphasize that merits, across the boards, and COLAs address different issues.
7. Strong and continuing support of the post-tenure review process and step system, balanced with the acknowledgement that off-scale salaries will continue to be necessary in many cases.
8. Urge systemwide study of "salary bump" upon rank promotion, as currently done by Berkeley and San Diego
9. Urge study of benefits that may be particularly helpful to young faculty hires (e.g. housing assistance or childcare)
10. Urge study of new or expanded benefits that might help retention of mid-career faculty.
11. It is not clear that there is consensus on how to best address the salary lag issues beyond the 3%/year range adjustment. One option is more across the board increases. Another is to allocate the balance to the campuses largely to fix the loyalty penalty and/or to take preventive steps such as promotion bumps or other targeted increases. Regardless, such decisions should be made in consultation with the local Senate.