

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION
(CAPRA)

Tuesday, April 29, 2014

2:30 – 4:00 pm

KL 362

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

AGENDA

- I. Chair's Report – *Anne Kelley*
- II. Consent Calendar
- A. Approval of the agenda
- B. Approve of the April 14 meeting minutes Pg. 1-3
- III. FTE Process – *Anne Kelley*
- Discussion:** CAPRA members to discuss a proposed method to track which future FTEs have already been “borrowed” for current use.
- IV. Campus Review Item Pg. 4-5
- A. FWDAF committee's proposed diversity hires.
- Action requested:** CAPRA to review the memo and send comments by May 15.
- V. Systemwide Review Items
- A. [APM 190 Appendix A-2 \(Whistleblower Protection Policy\)](#).
- The proposal implements policy requirements mandated by an amendment to the California Whistleblower Protection Act that became effective January 1, 2011. CAP and FWDAF are lead reviewers. *Policy can be viewed at UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources/Review Items – Systemwide.*
- Action requested:** CAPRA to review proposed revisions. Comments are due to Senate Chair on May 7.
- B. [Compendium Revisions](#).
- Revisions can be viewed at UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources/Review Items – Systemwide.*
- Action requested:** CAPRA to review proposed revisions. Comments are due to Senate Chair by May 21.
- VI. Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
April 14, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 3:30 pm on April 14, 2014 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

I. Chair's Report

--Member Singhal updated CAPRA members on the April 10 special meeting of Division Council at which Provost Peterson provided an update on the FTE situation. The Provost announced that there will likely be only 3-5 new faculty FTE lines next year and asked for input on whether a FTE process should occur for so few lines. The remaining FTE lines for next year will be carry overs from any unfilled search this year as well as any necessary replacement lines. The Provost and Division Council will notify the faculty of the final decision on the allocation process of the new lines.

--Chair Kelley announced that nothing of significance to UC Merced was discussed at the April 1 UCPB meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: Today's agenda was approved as presented.

III. Campus Review Items

--CAPRA members discussed the Committee on Research's (COR) proposed policies for the establishment and review of research units. Concerns included: not enough authority granted to the faculty, the unwarranted coupling of research merit with the funding mechanism, and the burdensome review cycle in light of faculty members' membership in several programs and groups.

ACTION: Committee analyst will circulate a draft memo to committee members for review and approval. A final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of April 18.

--CAPRA members discussed the revised Mechanical Engineering graduate proposal. While the ambitious growth profile may still be an issue, CAPRA members saw no further, significant complications.

ACTION: CAPRA voted to approve the revised proposal to move forward in the process. Committee analyst will notify the Senate Chair by the deadline of April 21.

--CAPRA members discussed the revised Sociology graduate proposal and were satisfied with the revisions.

ACTION: CAPRA voted to approve the revised proposal to move forward in the process. Committee analyst will notify the Senate Chair by the deadline of April 18.

--CAPRA members discussed the Molecular Cell Biology graduate proposal. Overall, CAPRA had no significant concerns.

ACTION: CAPRA voted to approve the revised proposal to move forward in the process. Committee analyst will notify the Senate Chair by the deadline of April 21.

--CAPRA members discussed the revised EECS graduate proposal. As one member recused from this discussion, quorum was lost and no vote was taken.

ACTION: CAPRA members will vote via email to approve the revised proposal. Committee analyst will notify the Senate Chair by the deadline of April 25.

IV. Other Business

Chair Kelley suggested that due to the lack of a traditional FTE request process this year, CAPRA should determine other ways to engage in the campus's academic space and resources conversation. One suggestion was

for CAPRA to propose to the Provost a method on how to track the process of using a future faculty FTE line to fulfill a current search. This item will be placed on the next CAPRA agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

DRAFT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY & ACADEMIC FREEDOM
RUDY ORTIZ, CHAIR
rortiz@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

April 14, 2014

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Division Council

From: Rudy Ortiz, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Ortiz", is placed below the "From:" line.

Re: Diversity Hires

On April 7, 2014, the faculty at UC Merced was informed that there may be only three to five faculty lines available next year, and that Provost Peterson is leaning towards allocating no faculty lines for next year.

The Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom committee advocates taking this limitation as an opportunity to promote excellence and diversity at UC Merced. Instead of not having any searches, we suggest using this as an opportunity to find candidates that can contribute to diversity across the University.

We suggest that the Deans and the Provost work together to translate these three to five lines into target of opportunity hires. There are many ways that this can be done. We suggest the following:

- 1) Have a search in each school for a targeted area such as "Diversity and Inequality" or "Health Disparities." Permit the search to be open-ended and available for any area of expertise – across disciplines. Require each candidate to write a diversity statement.
- 2) Ask each bylaw unit to submit the CV of a candidate who would contribute to diversity at UC Merced and have bylaw units compete with one another to get the line.
- 3) Use the UCOP Postdoctoral Fellows program specifically for all hires.

Thank you for your consideration.

cc: FWDAF members
Senate office

CAPRA Comments on FWDAF's Proposed "Diversity Hires"

Comment 1:

I will set aside the philosophical issue of whether we should be using "diversity" as a primary criterion for hiring faculty and limit my comments to the practical problems with this suggestion. Our MAPP requires that all faculty positions be nationally advertised (ironically, in part to insure a large and diverse candidate pool). So there are two options: (1) make additional offers to candidates who have already applied to this year's search pools; (2) advertise new positions. If (1), given that it would be May before candidates could even be contacted, we would be limiting ourselves to applicants who were not able to get an offer from another institution. This is not the group from which to recruit excellent faculty. But attempting option (2) opens up all of the problems that caused the Provost to decide against allocating new lines for next year in the first place, plus some new ones. How would the fields to be searched be determined? It is against California law to use the race, gender, ethnicity, etc. OF THE APPLICANT as a basis for hiring decisions, so one could not insure that a "diverse" candidate would be chosen. One could legally choose to search in FIELDS that are diversity-related, such as FWDAF's suggestions of "Diversity and Inequality" or "Health Disparities," but we would need to have a thorough faculty discussion about whether such searches would really contribute to our goals of building strength in research fields and meeting our teaching needs. It would require a great deal of work by a large number of faculty and the deans for a very small payoff in terms of numbers of faculty lines.