

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**January 25, 2021**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on January 25, 2021, via Zoom. Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield

EVC/Provost Camfield discussed the following questions/issues that CAPRA submitted to him prior to this meeting:

- A. The necessity to align admission of graduate students with our ability to fund them and the desire to continue growth of the programs toward achieving R1 status.

APAPB Schnier stated that he and Interim VPDGE Kello met with graduate groups to discuss how they might plan their graduate enrollment cycles. In those meetings, APAPB Schnier provided information on the costs of different enrollment patterns so that graduate groups could learn how the campus can get to a sustainable approach for graduate student funding. In other words, given the size of our undergraduate programs, the size of the TAships being given, and given the current funding offered through grants and fellowships, what do steady state enrollments look like and what is the trajectory? APAPB Schnier emphasized that he was offering the graduate groups a model of reducing graduate student enrollment; he was not prescribing what graduate groups must do. There are different ways to support graduate students: the campus could increase undergraduate enrollment which would increase the number of TAs, or faculty could bring in more grant funding that would support graduate students, or the campus could provide more fellowships. For this year, APAPB Schnier suggested that graduate admissions be about 25% less than last year. The COVID-19 pandemic also had a major impact on graduate funding and the campus budget situation. APAPB Schnier acknowledged the negative feedback from faculty members as a result of his meetings with the graduate groups; he reiterated that the meetings were meant to be educational and informational so that graduate groups can see what it will take to reach sustainable graduate student enrollment.

EVC/Provost Camfield added that although TAships support graduate students and help with their professional development and teaching experience, there are other ways of supporting graduate students, i.e. advanced graduate students can teach summer session at UC Merced or a semester or summer at a community college. He mentioned that faculty, especially those in laboratory sciences, should put graduate students on their grants to the extent possible. EVC/Provost Camfield apologized for the miscommunication and stated that he has scheduled a meeting with both APAPB Schnier and Interim VPDGE Kello on consistent messaging. He also plans to meet with the deans to eliminate any confusion with the graduate groups and to make it clear that the exercise was intended to provide data regarding the campus's fiscal situation as

it relates to graduate students so that we can determine a way forward. APAPB Schnier added that in order for the campus to reach a steady state in a fiscal context, the reduction in graduate admissions would have been 50% which the campus will not do. EVC/Provost Camfield thus devised a staged process so the campus can work through the details.

A CAPRA member asked how the campus will reconcile increasing graduate students in the long term and conducting cutbacks this year. How much of the cutbacks for this year are just the result of our current fiscal situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and how much is a foundational issue? Is it a one-year reduction? EVC/Provost Camfield answered that the campus wants to spread out the negative impacts over a few years. A high percentage of the cutbacks are due to the pandemic. He reiterated the other ways to support graduate students (grants, fellowships, teaching summer sessions or a semester at a community college). He added that the campus needs to align its incentives with its needs. APAPB Schnier stated that the campus has always had a structural deficit with our graduate funding. The campus has always been able to absorb it, but it is no longer feasible. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that he wants CAPRA to ask the administration for anything the committee needs so that it can advise him on the balance between reaching R1 status and our graduate student enrollment.

- B. The temporary halt on campus backfill projects as announced in a recent email to campus from the administration. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that the campus will be using, as much as possible, funds from the general pool for startup funds to finance backfill projects. That will be possible since the campus will be hiring new faculty more slowly over the next few years. Moving forward, EVC/Provost Camfield wants the campus to allocate additional funds for faculty start-up packages in order to take into consideration the costs of refurbishment. APAPB Schnier informed CAPRA members that the campus's backfill projects will cost \$16 million over the next few years. The campus's goal is to complete the backfill projects, but it will take a longer time horizon and the campus must prioritize faculty research first.
- C. Impact of the Governor's proposed mid-year budget revision on the campus fiscal situation.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that according to UC Executive Vice President and CFO Nathan Brostrom, the markets and UC investments have done very well. The state's income is heavily based on a progressive income tax so the numbers look positive. However, Governor Newsom's budget is conservative and restores only one third of what the state cut from the UC last year. The COVID-19 pandemic had a disproportionately large impact on low income people which will have to be compensated for through social services. EVC/Provost Camfield informed CAPRA about the UC's Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP) policy and Total Return Investment Pool (TRIP) and stated that UC Merced will receive some return. There are four different investment pools but STIP (cash on hand) and TRIP (longer term and higher yield but still quite liquid) are most relevant to UC Merced as they ensure the campus stays liquid enough. UC Merced was not as badly affected by the pandemic as we thought with the exception of our auxiliary services which has taken a large hit. The funding the UC received from the federal economic stimulus packages

has helped. EVC/Provost Camfield anticipates additional funding from the most recently approved federal relief package and the UC hopes to receive funding from a fifth economic stimulus package under the new Biden administration.

- D. Updates on COVID-19 vaccine roll out given that the campus is anticipating in-person instruction in the fall.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that the campus is trying to get vaccines from two sources: 1) Merced county and 2) UC Health. Neither attempt has met with success yet but he hopes to have more information to share with Cabinet tomorrow. A CAPRA member pointed out that the Governor has lifted the stay at home order and the state will return to the tiered system of reopening. She asked whether the campus could begin hosting outdoor, low density events for students and faculty. Such events may begin to alleviate the feeling of alienation experienced by many. EVC/Provost Camfield supported this idea and will consult with Cabinet tomorrow.

- E. Is the ECEC going to be back in full operation?

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that the ECEC is anticipated to reopen in mid-to-late February with low density. There is no indication of when it will be fully reopened. AVCs Putney and Pollack may have more information on ECEC operations.

II. Chair's Report – *Patti LiWang*

A. January 5 UCPB meeting

The main item of relevance is that the UC retirement program is doing well. Prior to the pandemic, the Regents advocated for increased contributions.

B. January 25 Divisional Council meeting

Divisional Council's main item of discussion was the proposed academic planning targets. CAPRA Chair LiWang summarized CAPRA's concerns in the Council meeting. During a discussion of possible incentives the campus can provide to increase research grant funding, a Divisional Council member pointed out that at some universities, faculty members without productive research programs are asked to take on additional teaching duties. Divisional Council members debated this suggestion, stating that teaching is not a punishment and should therefore not be used as a punitive measure.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Today's agenda

B. [Draft December 15 meeting minutes](#)

**Action:** the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

## IV. Systemwide Review Item

- A. [Proposed revisions to Presidential Policy](#) UC-PS-20-0489-BUS-43 Purchases of Goods and Services; Supply Chain Management

A member has volunteered to serve as lead reviewer. The lead reviewer's comments will be discussed at the February 8 meeting. CAPRA's comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Tuesday, February 16.

## V. ORU Proposal – UC Merced Community and Labor Center

Given the additional documentation that the ORU proposal's lead author submitted to the Senate, committees, including CAPRA, were given an extension to the deadline for comments to the Senate Chair.

While CAPRA members supported the objectives contained in the ORU proposal, the committee was unclear on how well positioned they are to make recommendations that would have long term financial implications. Any recommendations that CAPRA makes on resource allocation will have to take into account how the campus will look in ten years. The proposed ORU will likely need additional funds from the campus.

APAPB Schnier stated that from conversations he has held with Interim VCORED Zatz, ORUs will, in the future, roll up from the VCORED in terms of the campus budget call process. Interim VCORED Zatz has endorsed the proposed ORU but her letter of support stated that she would not be able to provide the proposed ORU's funds in the future. CAPRA members agreed that the campus needs to re-examine how ORUs are financed and that the Senate should have oversight over that process.

CAPRA members agreed that they would prefer to see a commitment from the campus as part of the ORU review process.

## VI. Consultation with APAPB Schnier &amp; Assistant EVC Martin

- A. Phase III Academic Planning submissions  
B. Evaluation of plans moving forward into the 21-22 AY

APAPB Schnier and Assistant EVC Martin presented to CAPRA a set of slides regarding Phase III of academic planning.

Phase III 5-year plans will be due on May 14, 2021.

- Strategies sequenced over five years (prioritization)
- For the first two years of strategies, "details" provided
- For the first two years, prioritized strategies address priorities outlined in Provost letter to Deans:

- contribute to growth in undergraduate (and self-paying masters) enrollment
- increase grant funding
- support diversity objectives

At the start of AY 2021-22, CAPRA would review the 5-year plans and provides guidance, as desired, for plan revisions.

AY 2021-22:

Plans revisited and revised:

- “Details” provided for the AY 23-24 strategies outlined in the May 14 submission
- Leave strategies proposed for AY 24-25 and 25-26 “as is”
- Propose strategies (without “details”) for AY 26-27

AY 2022-23 and beyond:

Annually schools/divisions iteratively develop their five year plans by:

- generating detailed plans for one upcoming year (the 2nd year) of the plan
- propose strategies (without detail) for the fifth year of the plan.

5-Year Plan Development:

**AY 20-21**

- Action: Submit 5-Yr Plan for AY 21-22 to 25-26
- Resource Allocation for 21-22: None
- Planning Priority for AY 21-22: Enrollment growth (UG, masters); grant awards; diversity.
- Plan:
  - 21-22 - Details
  - 22-23 - Details
  - 23-24 - Strategies
  - 24-25 - Strategies
  - 25-26 - Strategies

**AY 21-22**

- Action: Submit 5-Yr Plan for AY 22-23 to 26-27
- Resource Allocation for 22-23: Maybe
- Planning Priority for AY 22-23: Enrollment growth (UG, masters); grant awards; diversity.
- Plan:
  - 22-23 – Details (same)
  - 23-24 - Details (new)
  - 24-25 - Strategies (same)
  - 25-26 – Strategies (same)
  - 26-27 – Strategies (new)

**AY 22-23**

- Action: Submit 5-Yr Plan for AY 23-24 to 27-28
- Resource Allocation for 23-24: Presumably
- Planning Priority for:
  - AY 23-24: Determined AY 21-22.
  - AY 24-25: Determine AY 22-23.
- Plan:
  - 23-24 – Details (same)
  - 24-25 - Details (new)
  - 25-26 - Strategies (same)
  - 26-27 – Strategies (same)
  - 27-28 – Strategies (new)

With regard to measures, APAPB Schnier asked CAPRA whether he should convey to deans that the campus wants to focus on a few measures in the near term with the understanding that all measures will be addressed in the long term. A CAPRA member pointed out that some faculty will view that negatively, claiming that the administration had their own way of measuring faculty's success and contributions that were not shared with them in advance. They want to be able to highlight their own success and contributions using their own dimensions. APAPB Schnier acknowledged this sentiment. But he added that deans asked him for the priorities to narrow down the focus. Deans asked him what measures will actually be tracked, what strategies they should focus on, and how success will be measured. APAPB Schnier emphasized that the campus will focus on certain measures in the first two years of 5-year plans, but all measures will matter.

A CAPRA member questioned the extent to which deans have control over enrollment. Another member pointed out that according to campus enrollment conversations, an important strategy is to start new programs that will attract a lot of undergraduate students. If the campus does not have a program in a certain area of study nor any appropriate faculty, the deans are in the best position to determine how to speak to existing faculty about extending themselves into areas of study they would not normally be connected to in order to grow the new programs. Faculty have the authority to start new programs, but in the absence of appropriate faculty in a certain area, the deans would play a role in establishing a new program. APAPB Schnier agreed. Curriculum is a faculty-driven exercise, not an administrative one, but the deans can help leverage if the campus does not yet have enough faculty to start a new program.

APAPB Schnier stated that he would like to speak with CAPRA again before he speaks to the deans.

**Action:** APAPB Schnier will send today's slides to CAPRA members.

VII. Consultation with LAUC-M Representative

Deputy University Librarian Donald Barclay spoke to CAPRA about his interest in attending CAPRA meetings on a regular basis or periodically depending on the issue.

**Action:** Due to time constraints, CAPRA will later decide whether the LAUC-M representative should have a standing invitation to all CAPRA meetings or if the representative should be invited to a meeting if the need arises.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair