

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
December 15, 2020

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on December 15, 2020, via Zoom. Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Chair's Report – *Patti LiWang*

A. November 30 Special Divisional Council meeting re: medical education

Divisional Council members met with Medical Director Thelma Hurd and SNS Dean Betsy Dumont about the proposed medication education program. The program has been appropriated \$15 million per year and there was political pressure to establish the program as soon as possible. As a result, Director Hurd and Dean Dumont began working with UCSF-Fresno on a framework for the program prior to soliciting faculty consultation. At this time, they are seeking faculty input. Director Hurd and Dean Dumont will meet with the chairs of UGC and GC about the proposed BS-MD program.

B. December 11 Divisional Council meeting

- i. The ECEC is scheduled to reopen next year with its regular staff. However, the capacity will be reduced, strict health and safety protocols must be followed, the cost per student will increase, and infants will not be permitted. Chair LiWang expressed concern about the cost increase implications for graduate students and post docs. CAPRA GSA representative Bennett stated that she will consult with her colleagues. CAPRA members discussed the ramifications of a potential coronavirus outbreak at the ECEC and its effect on the campus research enterprise.
- ii. The LASC chair gave a presentation on that committee's business over the fall semester as well as Library updates. There is hope for a new UC-Elsevier agreement by the end of the year.
- iii. Divisional Council members discussed the pre-proposal to establish the Gallo School of Management. Members agreed that the pre-proposal would benefit from more evidence of campus buy-in before it is transmitted to the systemwide level. Senate Vice Chair (and CAPRA member) Westerling suggested that campus leadership should provide clarity on the campus's fiscal outlook. A Divisional Council member suggested to the Senate Chair that she facilitate the revision process of the pre-proposal by highlighting the main areas of concern and relay them to the lead authors of the pre-proposal so they can consult with key stakeholders.

C. December 8 UCPB meeting

Six of the ten UC campuses are not implementing curtailment measures. UC Merced leadership issued an email to the campus recently that announced there will be no curtailment on this campus. However, cost-cutting measures such as pay cuts may be implemented in the future.

II. Senate Vice Chair's report – *LeRoy Westerling*

Senate Vice Chair Westerling stated that he and the Senate Chair spoke with the EVC/Provost about the ECEC, proposed salary reduction (it was agreed that a reduction would not be imposed), and the challenges of communicating with the campus during remote work.

III. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda
- B. Draft November 24 meeting minutes

Action: the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

A. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Report Review

The review of ILTI was completed in 2018 by the systemwide Provost's Office, with the assistance of Huron Consulting, to gain a better understanding of its current state and determine the best options for ILTI's future.

A CAPRA member inquired about the value added of ILTI, specifically, if online education is offered permanently after the pandemic, what would distinguish that UC online degree versus attaining a degree at another university? Attaining a degree on campus offers students the experience of interacting and forging connections with their cohort and receiving mentorship from their professors. However, public funding as a share of the cost of education has declined. In the absence of increased funding, some fear that higher education will become a tiered system whereby a large number of students receive their degrees online while a smaller elite is able to receive an in-person education.

CAPRA's lead reviewer pointed out the section of the ILTI report that indicated that less than 50% of students completed the course. The CAPRA member stated that she'd hoped the report would include students' reviews of the course to determine why the completion rate was so low. The structure of the program was modified such that a faculty member is now managing it. A consulting firm was hired but the firm's findings did not reveal the root cause of why the program was not successful. The review took two years and resulted in an assessment focused only on numbers of courses and students, leaving an assessment of role and value to the reviewing committees without data to use as a basis. There was also no comparison of the cost of instruction for on-line courses relative to in-person courses. There is a general acknowledgement

that preparing high-quality on-line course materials requires additional time. There is an implication that financial resources are conserved by offering cross-campus courses and/or by offering larger courses.

A CAPRA member stated that it would be helpful to know the value added for the campus in terms of resources.

CAPRA members agreed that the committee would need further information on:

- What are the financial ramifications of offering the ILTI program?
- For example, more specifically, under what circumstances does the program decrease costs e.g. when investment in added infrastructure is avoided by offering large classes and/or by being able to reduce the number of classes that are offered by including students from multiple campuses?

A CAPRA suggested that the lead reviewer's comments about courses is very helpful and should be provided to UGC.

Action: the committee analyst will distribute a draft memo to CAPRA members for review and approval. CAPRA's comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Friday, January 8. The committee analyst will also forward CAPRA's lead reviewer's comments to the UGC chair and analyst.

B. Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The task force was charged with examining the issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular excessive reliance on off scale pay to achieve competitive compensation.

CAPRA's lead reviewer explained that the proposal encourages substantial increases in salary scales overall and decreased reliance on off scale salaries. The proposal does not articulate the logistics of how the university plans to transition to a new system. This is problematic, given the challenges that occurred the last time the university implemented such measures. Specifically, the amounts by which the salary scales were adjusted were much more modest than proposed currently while at the same time health care and retirement deductions increased rapidly. Also, faculty with off scale adjustments were in theory denied the regular salary increases designed to implement the new policy in order to increase equity. Many senior faculty negotiated to preserve their off scale salaries. Junior faculty were less successful in this regard. When the system was eliminated, those formerly junior faculty had salaries that had largely stagnated. Finally, previous implementation assumed that faculty with off scale increments to their salary were receiving a competitive salary already, while for many this was not true.

CAPRA members agreed that the university should spend more time considering the process for implementing this proposal.

Action: the committee analyst will distribute a draft memo to CAPRA members for review and approval. CAPRA's comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Friday, January 15.

V. Campus Review Items

A. MAPP 025 – Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities

This section supersedes the current MAPP 1003.

Per APM 025-14, all faculty holding appointments in the following title series are subject to this policy: (1) Professor, including Acting titles, (2) Professor in Residence, (3) Adjunct Professor, (4) Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), (5) Health Sciences Clinical Professor, (6) Clinical Professor of Dentistry, (7) Lecturer with Security of Employment, including Acting titles. The title series currently used at UC Merced which are subject to this policy include: Professor, Adjunct Professor, and Lecturer with Security of Employment (also known as Teaching Professor).

Summarized below are the proposed key policy revisions:

- i. Renumbered the policy as MAPP 025 to align with the system-wide policy APM 025
- ii. Reformatted the content to align with the system-wide policy outline
- iii. Removed language that is redundant of system-wide policy
- iv. Outlined key responsibilities for Faculty, Department Chairs, Deans, the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

In light of current Senate activities related to anti-Black racism, Senate Chair DeLugan invites committees to review this item with special attention to generating recommendations for ways to intentionally maximize and promote equity, diversity, and inclusion, reduce, and eventually eliminate anti-Black racism and other forms of structural racism and inequities.

Action: CAPRA identified a lead reviewer whose comments will be discussed via email. CAPRA's comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Tuesday, January 12.

B. Academic Planning Targets

These are proposed institutional-level targets for a select subset of the Measures developed by the Academic Planning Work Group.

As part of this review, to inform the development of the campus' strategic plan, the Senate is asked to advise on the following two items:

1. The proposed targets.
2. The institutional support and infrastructure that need to be developed for the campus to reach the three, five and 10-year targets outlined in the document.

CAPRA's lead reviewer explained to the committee that as the document states, UC Merced is far below the UC average, and far below our near-peer UCs. (Our current per-faculty funding is \$137,000, while UCR/UCSC/UCSB have an average of \$227,000.) The ten-year goal is to increase our per-faculty funding to \$180,000, which is still far below our near-peers. Three- and five-year goals each modestly increase our per-faculty funding. The three-year target is to increase per-faculty funding by \$8,000 per year (almost 6%), which (presumably due to increases in overall faculty numbers) leads to a 25% increase in overall grant funding. This target seems to assume a relatively large increase in faculty, as overall funding is targeted to increase from \$40 million to \$50 million in just three years. The lead reviewer went on to state that given that there will be very few faculty members hired in the next few years, it seems unlikely that the campus could increase its overall funding level to \$50 million (25% from current levels) in three years. However, increasing the per-faculty grant funding to \$145,000 (an almost 6% increase from current levels) might be achievable in three years.

CAPRA members agreed that a key issue is to identify the reasons for current low faculty grant funding and deliver resources to address those causes. The relevant Senate committees and the administration should focus heavily on this, as it is central to many of the challenging issues before our campus, including the need to increase graduate student funding.

A CAPRA member stated that the committee should clearly convey to the administration ways in which the campus can achieve the academic planning targets. For example, hiring more faculty, providing improved grant support, and asking faculty members what they need to be successful. The campus should analyze why it is not getting appropriate funding and then CAPRA can recommend areas in which resources should be allocated in order to meet the targets.

CAPRA's lead reviewer also discussed undergraduate student-to-faculty ratios. The administration wants to quickly increase the number of undergraduate students. If the campus is successful in this, the only way to decrease the student to faculty ratio is also to rapidly increase the number of faculty. If we expect 1,800 more students, and the target is to have a student to faculty ratio of 30:1, we would need to hire 60 more faculty within three years just for those students, in addition to modest increases in faculty to lower the ratio for the existing students. Given the university's current budget issues, it appears that we cannot attain this goal within three years. It is not clear that we could hire sufficient faculty in the 5-year period either, given the continuing increase in student count that is expected.

With regard to doctoral conferrals and number of graduate students, the three-year target is to increase annual doctoral conferrals by almost a factor of two (from 45.2 to 90.1). The number of overall PhD students is also proposed to be increased by about 200 during this period (from 696 to 902). These graduate students would need to be funded by TA-ships or RA-ships; if we did indeed enroll 1800 more undergraduates (as targeted), and increase our grant funding, this may be possible. However, it does seem doubtful that the campus can double the number of PhDs granted in only three years. A CAPRA member asked how the campus can increase its doctoral conferrals (admitting students and not cutting the size of our graduate programs) and ensure our graduate students are completing their degree in a timely manner. The campus needs to research what the barriers are to achieving those goals. CAPRA's

GSA representative asked how UC Merced’s graduate students’ time to degree completion compares to other institutions. The CAPRA chair replied that varies across fields. Key questions to ask are: do graduate students take longer to finish their degree at UC Merced compared to other universities (adjusted for field)? Do graduate students leave the program without a PhD more often at UC Merced than at other universities and how can we increase retention? Do we attract a sufficient quantity and quality of graduate student applicants to plausibly increase our numbers of enrolled students and students who complete the PhD?

In general, CAPRA members agreed that the campus should work to get specific answers regarding the above questions and to allocate resources toward those areas revealed to be critical to achieve the target.

Action: the committee analyst will distribute a draft memo to CAPRA members for review and approval. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by Tuesday, January 12.

C. ORU Proposal – UC Merced Community and Labor Center

The materials include Interim VCORED Zatz’s letter of support and COR’s assessment and endorsement of the revised ORU proposal. The policy for the establishment and review of ORU proposals was also provided to CAPRA.

Action: CAPRA identified a lead reviewer whose comments will be discussed by the committee via email. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by Friday, January 22.

VI. Consultation with EVC/Provost and APAPB on academic planning phase III timeline

A CAPRA member shared with EVC/Provost Camfield and APAPB Schnier that one of the challenging components of the School and Division draft academic plans in phase II was that each School and Division had a different interpretation of what “strategy” meant. Some strategies were aspirational while others were specific. CAPRA members agreed that strategies should be more specific, e.g. they should state who will be responsible for executing the strategies (dean, faculty committee, etc.) and articulate which resources should be linked to the strategies.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated in his cover memo to the School and Division leads (distributed on December 14), that he agreed with CAPRA that Schools and Divisions need to prioritize their goals for phase III. A CAPRA member suggested new phrasing for asking Schools and Divisions to articulate their resource needs: what resources (School/Division-wide and campus-wide) can the campus provide you in the achievement of your strategies?

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that he will be asking VPDUE Frey and Interim VPDGE Kello to create an analysis for benchmarks and opportunities for improvements.

EVC/Provost Camfield informed CAPRA members that he will ask the Schools and Divisions to focus on sequencing rather than prioritizing. That way, faculty will understand that the administration will carry out the various requests, but in a certain order rather than all at once. EVC/Provost Camfield added that he will make it clear that sequencing should be done in the School plan rather than at the department level. He inquired whether Schools and Divisions should be asked to include a limited number of goals. APAPB Schnier suggested the alternative of requesting a distribution of goals over time.

CAPRA members then had a discussion with EVC/Provost Camfield and APAPB Schnier on whether Schools and Divisions should include dollar amounts with their phase III academic plans. EVC/Provost Camfield answered that there are additional resources other than money, but understands the efficacy of asking for dollar amounts. The EVC/Provost stated that he wants CAPRA's advice on comparative advantage and capacity, specifically, whether a School or Division initiative is so overdue and such a glaring need that the campus should address it immediately.

APAPB Schnier reminded CAPRA that the committee should consider how resources are being aligned with the indices. CAPRA members again pointed out that dollar amounts would be useful in the committee's review of the phase III academic plans. If CAPRA is going to make recommendations on where Schools and Divisions should place their focus, the committee needs to know the costs for the different activities the Schools and Divisions want to accomplish so CAPRA can tell if they are making recommendations that are not fiscally feasible. EVC/Provost Camfield agreed and stated that dollar amounts should be requested for phase III plans if we have appropriate error bars and if the Office of Financial Planning and Analysis can provide the appropriate numbers. APAPB Schnier also agreed and suggested a mission cost matrix analysis.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair