

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION
(CAPRA)

Thursday, February 13, 2014

3:30 – 4:30 pm

KL 362

Documents found at [UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources](https://ucmcrops.org/capra1314/resources)

AGENDA

- I. Chair's Report – *Anne Kelley***
A. Update from UCPB meeting on January 7 and February 4
- II. Consent Calendar**
A. Approval of the agenda
B. Approval of the December 10, 2013 meeting minutes **Pg. 1-4**
- III. FTE Process** **Pg. 5-8**
Discussion: Prepare questions for Provost Peterson on the following:
A. Timeline for FTE requests. The process and criteria for evaluating FTE requests that CAPRA drafted in fall 2013 and submitted to the Provost is included in agenda packet.
B. Possible sweeping of unexpended funds in faculty startup accounts and other faculty-controlled accounts such as graduate group support funds.
- IV. Guest - *Provost Peterson*** **4:00 – 4:30 pm**
Update on FTE process and campus budget
- V. Other Business**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
December 10, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 2:30 pm on December 10, 2013 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley updated the CAPRA members on the following topics:

--UCPB meeting on December 3. The two major topics were composite benefit rates and self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDP).

--Provost Peterson informed Chair Kelley that his call for new FTEs will be sent after the first of the new year as he wants to wait until the campus budget is finalized. CAPRA will have to revise its timeline and may have to review FTE requests starting in April or May. Chair Kelley announced she will email Division Council and the School Executive Committee chairs to inform them of CAPRA's delayed timeline.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: Today's agenda was approved as presented.

III. Course Buyout Policy

Provost Peterson recently submitted a revised policy in response to Senate committees' comments on his previous iteration. CAPRA members held a lengthy discussion on the revised policy and its implications. Some committee members felt the cost of buying out a course (1/6 of salary) is reasonable, as is the provision for returning the extra funds to the School Deans. Other committee members pointed out that course buyout should not be pegged to faculty members' salaries and that the cost of buying out a course should be a fixed dollar amount that accounts for the cost of hiring a lecturer for one course. These latter committee members felt that this revised policy discourages faculty from buying out courses, taxes faculty grants, and

allocates the money to the Schools using a method that is not wholly transparent.

ACTION: CAPRA's response to Division Council will be to request that Division Council conduct research to discover how other UC campuses handle course buyout, specifically, how they determine the cost of buying out courses. Committee analyst will draft a memo to circulate among the members for review and approval. A final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of December 13.

IV. Guests - Dan Feitelberg, VC for Planning & Budget and Emma Loethen, Interim Budget Director

VC Feitelberg shared a hand out from UCOP that summarized the various options and definitions surrounding composite benefit rates. VC Feitelberg related that the composite benefit rates issue is linked to UC PATH and the latter is undergoing further review prior to implementation. However, UC PATH will move forward after the first of the new year, so it is important to address composite benefit rates.

UC Merced currently does not budget for composite benefit rates; rather, the campus pays for the benefits as they are incurred. Composite benefit rates are designed as a planning tool to provide predictability. The handout included the four rate modeling options that were offered by systemwide. VC Feitelberg acknowledged that campuses may need to do their own modeling to decide their own options and groupings.

VC Feitelberg asked CAPRA members to share their concerns about composite benefits rates so he can relate the concerns back to systemwide. CAPRA members stated they want stability in the rate modeling. For example, when trying to hire a postdoc on a grant, it is often not possible to know whether the grant has enough money to afford the postdoc unless the benefit rate can be known before the person is hired. A composite benefit rate would achieve this.

VC Feitelberg emphasized the need for clarity on the options that UC Merced faculty are requesting so that proper analysis can be performed in order to have a more meaningful conversation as UC PATH moves forward. In response to a committee member's inquiry about whether campuses can choose to group employees differently and assess different rates on them, VC Feitelberg responded that there does need to be options for all types of employees, beyond options A–D provided by UCOP. However, there is still not enough clarity on this.

VC Feitelberg ended his comments to the committee by stating that the campus needs to consider two important issues: 1) the short term and long term (extramural funding) impacts on our faculty and 2) unfunded commitments currently on campus such as faculty start up.

V. Committee on Research's Memo on Library's 2020 Space Plan

The Committee on Research (COR) previously sent a memo to Division Council stating its concerns about the Library's 2020 Space Plan. Division Council invited all Senate committees to provide input on the memo.

CAPRA members agreed with all of COR's main points, however, CAPRA members requested clarity on COR's statement that a different unit – other than the Library – should manage the planning of study hall spaces.

ACTION: CAPRA's memo to Division Council will state that the committee agrees with COR's main points but requests an answer on which unit should be in charge of planning study hall space if not the Library. Committee analyst will circulate a draft memo among the committee members for review and approval. A final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by December 13.

VI. Systemwide Review Item - Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP)

Chair Kelley summarized the discussion that UCPB held on December 3. UCPB members requests clarification of the criteria for establishing new programs. UCPB members agreed that the new programs should either strengthen existing academic programs, serve a well-defined need for the state of California, or serve a defined student population. In other words, SSGPDP's should not exist merely to make money. CAPRA members discussed the connection to the course buyout issue: faculty may be pulled away from their obligations to their regular, non-self-supporting programs in favor of SSGPDPs. However, CAPRA members agreed that since these types of programs are not currently implemented at UC Merced , the committee will decline to comment on the systemwide request to review the proposed policy changes to SSGPDPs.

ACTION: Committee analyst will transmit a memo to the Senate Chair stating that CAPRA declines to comment on this systemwide review item.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

**UC Merced CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation)
Process and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty FTE Requests for AY 2014-2015**

In an effort to make the process as transparent as possible and to encourage discussion between disciplinary groups, CAPRA is specifying a two-part process for this year's FTE requests. In the first round, recognized faculty groups (see below) will be asked to submit descriptions and justifications for proposed new faculty lines, without any higher-level prioritization. These requests will be posted to CROPS and made accessible to all faculty. Each faculty group will be encouraged to discuss its requests with other related groups, with the goal of minimizing duplication, enhancing synergy between groups, and identifying areas for proposed cluster hires. Any revisions to the initially requested positions will be posted to the CROPS site. These revised requests will then be discussed and prioritized by the Schools (deans and faculty) and submitted to CAPRA.

Round 1: due Feb. 3, 2014 to the Senate office (senateoffice@ucmerced.edu)

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.

Round 2: due Feb. 18, 2014 to the Senate office, lead Dean, and School Executive Committee

Groups that wish to revise their FTE requests will submit the same information requested in Round 1. 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, or a modification thereof. It is strongly recommended that one or more Bylaw 55 units be associated with each request at this stage.

Final prioritized request from Schools: due Mar. 18, 2014 to the Senate office

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 identified as a campus priority) 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 and strategic plans, 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.

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 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.

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 |
|------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |