

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
February 11, 2020

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 11:00 am on February 11, 2020 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield

EVC/Provost Camfield informed CAPRA members that former Chancellor Leland tasked the administration to review a new campus mission statement. That draft statement is now ready for campus review, including the Senate. The EVC/Provost asked CAPRA to consider the mission statement in practical terms, and whether it could feasibly be placed into operation for academic planning.

EVC/Provost Camfield updated CAPRA members on Interim Chancellor Brostrom's effort to revise the indirect cost return policy in order to return a higher percentage of indirect costs to the research mission. He then shared his and HR's efforts to reexamine the salary levels of research administrators using national market data as a benchmark rather than systemwide market data. The results of this research revealed that the salaries of UC research administrators are low compared to the nationwide level.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that he and APAPB Schnier will ask CAPRA for input on indirect cost return distribution, especially the percentage that should be allocated to the EVC/Provost and the deans. The current, draft proposal has a provision for Center grants that are at least \$5 million and for five years that states that the campus will return half of the indirect costs to the Center. However, this is still a draft policy that will eventually come to the Senate for review. A CAPRA member asked for data on other UC campus indirect cost formulas and EVC/Provost Camfield replied that he will obtain this information. He then reiterated his plan to establish bridge funding for faculty.

EVC/Provost Camfield announced to CAPRA members that he extended the deadline for the submission of Phase I academic planning documents. The documents will be submitted to CAPRA and the EVC/Provost once they are completed.

EVC/Provost Camfield and CAPRA members then held a brief discussion on appropriate benchmarks for academic planning. EVC/Provost Camfield pointed out that benchmarks from external institutions can be helpful; the campus already has, or can easily obtain, benchmarks about student success. He added that the campus should think about which benchmarks align best with the campus's values. Specifically, what action should we take when the departmental or School vision appears to diverge from the campus-wide view of what UCM is trying to accomplish? EVC/Provost Camfield asserted that the campus needs variation, but cohesion as well. The campus also has to be thinking in terms of multiple time scales simultaneously.

A CAPRA member asked when the committee should comment on the draft indirect cost return proposal, i.e. whether the EVC/Provost would find it more helpful to seek CAPRA's comments in the drafting phase or after the draft is finished and comes to the Senate for review. It was decided that CAPRA will review the draft proposal when it is completed, but that APAPB Schnier would keep the committee updated on the draft policy during his regular consultations.

II. Chair's Report

Chair LiWang updated committee members on the following:

A. Division Council meeting February 3

- i. EVC/Provost Camfield discussed the possibility that the Supreme Court may rescind DACA and how the campus needs to prepare for UCM's affected students. UC needs to decide on degree completion.
- ii. The report from the Standardized Testing Task Force was issued.
- iii. Division Council discussed CAPRA's comments on the UCDC program, specifically, the need for funding for UCM students to participate in the program. Division Council members recommended that EVC/Provost Camfield consult with the Office of Development and Alumni Relations to seek funding opportunities.
- iv. Expiration of the Unit 18 lecturer union contract

B. UCPB meeting February 4

- i. Discussion of the expiration of the Unit 18 lecturer union contract. There appear to be communication issues between the union and the UC administrators.
- ii. Regents have instituted a process by which campus Chancellors conduct budget presentations. UCM Interim Chancellor Brostrom received excellent feedback on his presentation.
- iii. Discussion of whether the UC should continue partnering with faith-based health organizations that refuse to conduct certain types of treatment and provide certain types of medical advice for religious reasons. This affects not only providing health care, but research. This issue is currently before the Senate for review (CAPRA is not a lead reviewer).

III. Senate Vice Chair's Report

Senate Vice Chair DeLugan updated CAPRA members on the February 3 PROC meeting. The onsite reviews for both Chemistry and Cognitive & Information Science are being conducted presently. PROC also discussed how best to use various data that has been collected over the years on UCM's programs and who should have access to the data in order to identify patterns and trends.

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda
- B. Draft January 28 meeting minutes

Action: The consent calendar was approved with one addition to today's agenda: update on the Enrollment Strategy Committee.

V. Enrollment Strategy Committee (ESC)

CAPRA member Trounstine stated that the ESC will opine on UGC's proposed policy for enrollment of impacted programs. The ESC will be recommending enrollment targets to the EVC/Provost as well as a set of criteria for determination of impaction. APAPB Schnier has developed various models with metrics on how each department and School fits into the "best" and "worst" case scenario. However, what is "best" or "worst" at UCM is not necessarily true outside of the campus. Therefore, external benchmarks are needed and will be obtained in the near future. Trounstine added that at the next meeting, the ESC will discuss criteria and benchmarks for what determines the threshold for impaction. Because the ESC is comprised of both faculty and administrators, the committee believed that they should not determine impaction but instead recommend how the campus should think about impaction and create a menu of solutions to impaction.

VI. Consultation with APAPB Schnier

APAPB Schnier continued his discussion of the graduate funding model and the goal of instituting incentives in order to provide more resources to graduate programs. He emphasized that the model is still a draft and can change as the campus refines its vision. He suggested to CAPRA members that they practice using the model.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm.

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair