

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**Minutes of Meeting****February 22, 2021**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on February 22, 2021, via Zoom. Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield, APAPB & Interim CFO Schnier, and Assistant EVC/Provost for Academic Planning and Institutional Assessment Martin

A. Phase III Academic Planning submission process

Per CAPRA's suggestion under phase II of academic planning, Assistant EVC/Provost Martin created a spreadsheet for the submission of academic plans under phase III. Schools and Divisions will be asked to briefly describe their strategies that will advance the School and Division toward one or more of its goals. In other words, what are the School/Divisions' proposed plans of action to achieve their goals? They will also be asked to indicate which year the strategy will be initiated and what year the strategy will conclude. In addition, Schools and Divisions will be asked to indicate which measures will be impacted as a result of the strategies and an estimated, anticipated percent increase. If Schools and Divisions do not have data for certain measures, they can indicate that on the spreadsheet. APAPB Schnier pointed out that the campus won't fully know the causal impacts of all the pieces of information but having these numbers will be helpful for tracking long term goals.

A CAPRA member stated that a School or Division may assert that they cannot predict how their strategies will affect their measures. How would CAPRA and the EVC/Provost assess this? For example, if a School proposes to use their allocated funding to establish an incentive system whereby they give an internal award to faculty who bring in a certain number of grants in a year, does CAPRA have to recommend that they change their incentive system if it doesn't yield the outcomes they anticipated? EVC/Provost Camfield replied that if Schools and Divisions cannot demonstrate that they are using their allocated funding to achieve their targets, he would ask why they are aiming for targets that are unrealistic. The Schools and Divisions would run the risk of not being given appropriate funding for their FTE lines and other needs.

A CAPRA member pointed out that the submission requirements for phase II of academic planning was too complex and asked whether the draft spreadsheet for phase III can be more simplified. Perhaps Schools and Divisions could be asked to focus on only a few priorities for the first two years of their academic plans. They could be asked to include a summary page that lists the outcomes and strategies. EVC/Provost Camfield agreed that Schools and Divisions want

clarity and simplicity. However, he and CAPRA are reviewing the academic plans from an institutional perspective; therefore, CAPRA and the administration need the full complexity of information contained in the proposed spreadsheet.

A CAPRA member clarified that neither CAPRA nor the EVC/Provost is dictating to Schools and Divisions how to spend the money they are allocated. However, what should CAPRA do if a School or Division proposes a strategy that they claim will change a measure by a significant amount, but CAPRA sees that the data contradicts this claim? EVC/Provost Camfield replied that he does not know the answer yet. The campus is currently operating under an incremental budget. In the future, if the campus moves to a cost-based model, the EVC/Provost can see exactly how a School or Division is growing and can make a decision accordingly. The CAPRA member clarified whether mapping the measures to strategies is mostly for the School and Divisions' benefit because CAPRA and the EVC/Provost are looking at the impact on the measures. Ultimately, CAPRA and the EVC/Provost are not dictating to Schools and Divisions how to tailor their strategies. EVC/Provost Camfield confirmed both statements. A CAPRA member recommended that the EVC/Provost communicate to the Schools and Divisions that the spreadsheet, then, is for their benefit to help them achieve their objectives. EVC/Provost Camfield agreed.

A CAPRA member asked if the Schools and Divisions will be required to report how their funding was allocated across their various units. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that he wants this process to be transparent.

B. Strategic planning goals – UC Quality

CAPRA Chair LiWang stated that the strategic plan appears to be divergent from academic planning. Two of the three main goals of both documents (called UC Quality Research and UC Quality Education in the academic planning document) are directly under the purview of the faculty. Faculty have not played a large role in drafting the strategic plan so far; neither staff nor non-academic departments on campus should be crafting policy about campus research and education goals without significant input from faculty.

Assistant EVC/Provost Martin stated that UC Quality Research and UC Quality Education are both in the strategic plan but described in less specific terms. A CAPRA member stated that a major topic during academic planning discussions in previous academic years was that the campus needs to be on the same page with regard to delivering a UC quality education to students. Modifying the language of UC quality opens the door to varying interpretations. The language needs to be precise and the campus needs to agree that it is not going to sacrifice certain goals. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that the academic planning document will still be used, and no changes are being made. The difference is external branding with the strategic plan. A CAPRA

member stated that if the strategic plan is outward facing and being used by the administration to allocate money, that is highly problematic given that the strategic plan was not formulated by faculty.

CAPRA continued its discussion after EVC/Provost Camfield, APAPB Schnier, and Assistant EVC/Provost Martin left the meeting. CAPRA members expressed their concern about the possible divergence of strategic planning and academic planning after faculty members spent a significant amount of time drafting academic plans. They were also concerned about the potential for the administration to use the strategic plan rather than the academic plans to allocate resources. Another CAPRA member stated that it is his understanding that the strategic plan is not intended to allocate resources; rather, it is supposed to serve as a road map for administratively executing the campus academic goals that were established by the academic plans.

A CAPRA member stated that the committee needs to push to ensure that academic planning is incorporated into the strategic planning documentation. Another CAPRA member expressed frustration that she and her faculty colleagues have been reassured by the administration that their work during this academic planning process – unlike processes in the past – will not go to waste. If strategic planning is not taking into account academic planning, then the faculty's trust and confidence in the process will be undermined.

CAPRA members then discussed the most efficient way for the committee to get clarity on these issues. Two CAPRA members serve on the Strategic Planning Governance Committee and could raise these concerns with their committee colleagues.

Action: Chair LiWang will decide the next step for raising CAPRA's concerns with the administration on the possible divergence of strategic planning and academic planning. This discussion will be continued at the next CAPRA meeting.

II. Chair's Report – *Patti LiWang*

A. February 19 Divisional Council meeting

CAPRA Chair LiWang reported that the proposed revisions to the state budget restore the cuts made to the UC. The budget is not yet final. The other major update is that the state has decided that UC Health will no longer receive its own allotment of COVID-19 vaccines. The supply will come from Blue Shield and Kaiser. However, the UC is challenging this decision.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Today's agenda

B. Draft February 8 meeting minutes

Action: the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. Campus Review Items

A. Proposal for a Minor in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies

CAPRA identified a lead reviewer.

Action: The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the March 8 CAPRA meeting. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Wednesday, March 10.

B. Proposal for a Major in Writing Studies

CAPRA identified a lead reviewer. One CAPRA member has a conflict of interest with this proposal. CAPRA members agreed that this member can participate in committee discussions but cannot vote on the proposal or assist in drafting the committee’s memo to the Senate Chair.

Action: The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the March 8 CAPRA meeting. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Wednesday, March 31.

V. Systemwide Review Item

A. Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures (The "Gold Book")

These are proposed changes to the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures, which are applicable to UC Peace Officers: “Use of Force” policy, “Body Worn Video” policy, “Systemwide Response Teams” policy, and the “Concealed Carry Weapons” policy.

CAPRA identified a lead reviewer.

Action: The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the March 8 CAPRA meeting. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Friday, March 19.

VI. Executive Session

This session included voting committee members only. No minutes were recorded.

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

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair