

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**October 27, 2020**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on October 27, 2020, via Zoom. Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

- I. Chair's Report – *Patti LiWang*
  - A. October 20 Joint Council meeting
    - i. A new financial system, Alpha Financials, will be coming online in January. The system will improve the campus's financial and budgeting processes.
    - ii. Undergraduate student enrollment is critical to nearly all growth goals the campus wants to achieve.
    - iii. A new order from the Governor requires that any purchase between \$10,000 – \$250,000 must be made from a minority-owned vendor/company, otherwise the purchase will be subject to more approval scrutiny.
  - B. October 23 UCPB emergency meeting

The cost savings from the proposed curtailment program are not significant. The curtailment program is essentially a symbolic gesture to prove to the Legislature that the UC is attempting to cut costs in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. The program requires a minimum of five curtailment days, but there are no maximum number of days. The proposed program does not require a vote of the Regents, rather, UC President Drake can implement the program at his discretion. Individual campuses can impose more than five curtailment days but they must receive approval from the UCOP HR office. UCOP considered several plans to cut costs but the UC President's office decided on the curtailment program. The Academic Senate does not view the plan favorably.
- II. CAPRA Member Report – *Jessica Trounstone*
  - A. October 23 Divisional Council meeting
    - i. The state budget appropriated \$15 million for a medical education program. UCM, UCSF, and the UCSF/Fresno branch are drafting an MOU for collaboration. The EVC/Provost will establish two work groups that will require participation from UCM Senate faculty. The proposed work groups will be tasked with handling two main areas of planning for the medical education program: curriculum and admissions. UCM, UCSF, and UCSF/Fresno must operate under the standards of the accrediting authority for medical education programs. UCM will also need a HIPAA-certified computing system to deliver the medical program. This system would also be helpful for non-medical program faculty in their research. Public outreach will be required for the medical program and faculty are encouraged to participate.
    - ii. Interim VCORED Zatz and Associate VPF Valdez spoke with Divisional Council about their creation of ad hoc data dispute and authorship dispute boards. They asked for advice on whether these boards should be made permanent or remain ad hoc. A Divisional Council

member pointed out that the Senate, including CoR, was not consulted prior to the establishment of these ad hoc boards.

- iii. UCD will partner with UCM for COVID-19 testing.
- iv. The Senate action plan to address structural racism will include the formation of a work group who will be tasked with reviewing all Senate committee bylaws to find any language that can be perceived as non-inclusive.
- v. Comments from Senate committees and School Executive Committees on the proposed curtailment program were transmitted to the systemwide Senate chair.
- vi. The campus was prohibited from reopening the ECEC due to the requirements of the ECEC's license. However, the administration did not share why they did not pursue other license options or why the ECEC could not reopen even though schools in Merced have been reopening. The administration did acknowledge that the issues are budget related.
- vii. The Emergency Course Continuity Policy has been adopted for the spring semester. Hyflex courses must be approved by department chairs and deans must be kept informed.

### III. Senate Vice Chair's report – *LeRoy Westerling*

#### A. Updates from EVC/Provost

- i. The Senate Chair and Vice Chair discussed with the EVC/Provost the importance of shared governance in relation to the medical education program and the lack of faculty consultation on the proposed, new undergraduate degree program.
- ii. October 26 PROC meeting  
The Senate Vice Chair was unable to attend the meeting.

### IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda
- B. Draft October 13 meeting minutes

**Action:** The Consent Calendar approved as presented.

### V. Evaluation of Academic Plans

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members began reviewing the academic plans as submitted by Schools and Divisions, together with guidance documents from APAPB Schnier.

CAPRA members discussed how to evaluate the academic plans. Members debated whether they should review the plans' strategies or goals or both. It is unclear at this point whether all plans have enough detail for CAPRA to analyze them thoroughly. A CAPRA member reiterated that the committee is being asked to give recommendations to the EVC/Provost on how to allocate a pot of funding to the Schools and Divisions, not to individual programs. The committee is no longer being asked to make recommendations on the allocation of individual faculty FTE lines as they historically have done.

A CAPRA member reminded the committee of a previous committee member's statement that a useful way of viewing the academic plans is like investing in a portfolio where there are

successes and rewards and a need to address weaknesses. Similarly, Schools and Divisions have to make a justification for what they are requesting, including acknowledging gaps they need to fund. A CAPRA member stated that a prioritization of Schools and Divisions' requests would be useful for CAPRA's review, as it is not CAPRA's role to prioritize them. Another CAPRA member pointed out that for the next year, funding levels may remain constant for all Schools and Divisions, given the negative budgetary impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The EVC/Provost has already made his decisions on the allocation of individual faculty FTE lines which he distributed to deans via email on October 9.

A CAPRA member inquired about the feasibility of the Schools' and Divisions' strategies. Should CAPRA be reviewing 1) whether the strategies are feasible, 2) whether the strategies support their goals, and 3) do the goals support academic planning? However, another CAPRA member pointed out that it is not CAPRA's role to assess feasibility. CAPRA has to trust that their colleagues in the Schools and Divisions have already completed this work. Moreover, CAPRA cannot accurately make an assessment without knowing the dollar amounts.

A CAPRA member asked what Schools and Divisions want to see from the committee. They want CAPRA to give them suggestions on making their academic plans better so they can receive funding. Another CAPRA member suggested that the committee can start by analyzing the metrics on what the Schools and Divisions are all doing well. A CAPRA member stated that the committee needs a baseline of what the metrics are right now. He reviewed the Tableau dashboard and noted that some metrics are readily available but some are not. How is the campus developing the infrastructure to measure these things in the future and what information do we have right now? The CAPRA member also suggested that the strategies in the Schools' and Divisions' plans need to be action-oriented. Also, who will be responsible for carrying out the strategies - deans' offices, departments, or perhaps subcommittees?

EVC/Provost Camfield and APAPB Schnier then joined the meeting. The EVC/Provost stated that last year, the campus developed an academic planning process that was devised collaboratively between the administration and the Senate. He wants CAPRA to think institutionally when evaluating the academic plans, i.e. how all the elements fit together and what areas need to be resourced. He advised CAPRA to consider, at a high-level, how the pot of money would be allocated to the Schools and Divisions and let the Schools and Divisions do the intricate work of resourcing specific areas and programs. CAPRA should have two levels of perspective: 1) evaluate the Schools' and Divisions' goals to ensure that campus goals will be met and 2) consider what are the levers that incentivize motion towards those goals. The EVC/Provost added that the administration is formulating various models, i.e. budget, graduate student support, and he will ask CAPRA to review the models to ensure everything is lined up for the campus to carry out the academic plans.

A CAPRA member pointed out that the committee does not believe it can provide meaningful feedback to Schools and Divisions unless the committee knows the prioritization of the goals and

sees a budget. APAPB Schnier replied that he sent CAPRA members target documents prior to this meeting that are relevant to the academic plans which will be useful to CAPRA as they conduct their evaluation from an institutional perspective. A CAPRA member stated that the committee wants to know how each School and Division is performing according to the measures established by the previous year's Academic Planning Working Group, and then evaluate how that is related to the targets that APAPB Schnier provided. Another CAPRA member asked what the committee is looking for in terms of dollar amounts for Phase III of academic planning. The EVC/Provost responded that CAPRA should focus on performance-based budgeting. CAPRA's recommendations will allow the campus to one day select a budget model to utilize once the campus is mature.

A CAPRA member asked about the scope of this year's academic planning recommendations given that the EVC/Provost has already informed deans of their allotted faculty FTE lines for next year and given the budgetary impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The EVC/Provost replied that CAPRA's feedback needs to help the Schools and Divisions revise their draft academic plans. CAPRA should feel free to pose questions that can be sent to the Schools and Divisions about all the items the committee wishes to see in the academic plans. CAPRA's feedback will help build an enduring structure with the goal of conducting this analysis on an annual basis. The EVC/Provost added that he wants to institutionalize CAPRA's role on campus – an example of this is the CAPRA chair serving on Joint Council per the EVC/Provost's request.

The EVC/Provost told CAPRA members to draft a list of all the data points they need to formulate useful feedback on the School and Division plans. He will ensure that the committee receives that data. APAPB Schnier pointed out that the target documents he sent to CAPRA earlier this morning contained UC benchmarks that will be of use to the committee as they evaluate the academic plans. A CAPRA member asked APAPB Schnier if he could provide a spreadsheet of five-year benchmarks and indicate how each School and Division are doing. She asked for a limited number of measures on the spreadsheet. APAPB Schnier agreed to provide this information to CAPRA.

**Action:** CAPRA members agreed that they should evaluate the academic plans and provide feedback on how reasonable the strategies and goals were to the committee. CAPRA should inform the Schools and Divisions that the committee is seeking action-oriented strategies. Part of CAPRA's feedback can also be a request for a prioritization. Once APAPB Schnier provides the additional information, CAPRA members will divide up the School and Division academic plans, analyze how far each School and Division is from the benchmarks, assess whether the strategies and goals are reasonable, and request a prioritization. The deadline for CAPRA to complete their evaluation is November 9.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 am.

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair