

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**February 25, 2020**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 11:00 am on February 25, 2020 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair LiWang updated CAPRA members on the following:

A. Division Council meeting February 19

- i. The EVC/Provost informed Division Council members that the Department of Education completed its audit with regard to attendance of students who receive federal financial aid. Since it is not UC policy to track attendance, UC Merced faculty worked diligently to track student attendance to comply with the audit. EVC/Provost Camfield thanked faculty for their efforts. UC Merced has had to return only a small amount of aid to the federal government (another UC campus had to return a considerable amount). EVC/Provost Camfield added that the campus is trying to develop an easy solution for faculty members to track student attendance.

The EVC/Provost also shared with Division Council that the campus has applied for funding from UCOP to create a distance learning degree completion process for students who have had to leave the university for various reasons. Such a process would have to apply broadly to all such students, not only the students who would be negatively affected if DACA was rescinded.

- ii. The UC President Search Committee does not include faculty members, even though historically, the systemwide Senate Chair has been included. There is, however, a faculty advisory committee to the main search committee. Regents are scheduled to announce the new President in May.
- iii. The FWAF vice chair discussed with Division Council a nascent proposal that suggests the addition of a Teaching Professor to the CAP membership. Division Council members raised various concerns, including voting rights. FWAF will revise its proposal in response to comments raised.

II. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda
- B. Draft meeting minutes February 11, 2020

**Action:** The consent calendar approved as presented with one addition to the agenda: updates from the Enrollment Strategy Committee.

## II. Enrollment Strategy Committee (EMC)

CAPRA member Trounstine updated members on the recent EMC meeting. The committee will make enrollment projections based on historical trends at the departmental level and present to the deans. This information is intended to inform the deans as to what they can expect in terms of their Schools' growth. An EMC member raised the concern of the campus reaching too deep into the applicant pool and implication for student preparedness. The EMC may identify enrollment targets that "drill down" from the campus level to the Schools to the departments. The committee will then develop policy levers that deans and departments can use to increase enrollments. Other projects the EMC will engage in are conducting a study on what factors predict success for students and how that has changed over time, and, identifying at risk students and determining what types of structures the UC may put into place so the university can achieve a 4-6 year graduation rate while increasing the number of students we enroll on campus. EMC members realize the importance of resources being tied to students and faculty buy in with regard to increasing enrollment. The EMC is also gathering data from other UCs in terms of student credit hour delivery and majors per faculty.

## III. Academic Planning Phase I and II

Given that the campus is nearing the conclusion of Phase I of academic planning, CAPRA and APAPB Schnier are looking ahead to preparation for Phase II which are the draft, School/Division five-year plans. In support of this preparation, APAPB Schnier shared with CAPRA the documents entitled: Draft Format for School/Division Five-Year Academic Plans, Revised 5-Year Plan Submission and Review Timeline, and Goal Submission and Alignment Matrix Guide (the latter for use in Phase 1).

The revised timeline addresses a recommendation from the schools that submission of the plan initially be separated from the budget. In this timeline, the plan is submitted first and then several weeks later the plan with costs is submitted. The intention is to avoid planning that is driven by budget. At section V, APAPB Schnier notes the vocabulary might change slightly following additional consultation with the deans; the submission expectations will not. In sections V and VI, APAPB Schnier notes that requests for costs will be removed to a second document, if CAPRA agrees with the proposal to separate.

In response to APAPB Schnier's request for CAPRA input, CAPRA members reviewed the two documents and requested various revisions to the Draft Format for School/Division Five-Year Academic Plans:

- CAPRA recommended that APAPB Schnier separate "mission" and "vision" and clarify both terms to avoid multiple interpretation by Schools. In addition, "vision" is not used in the September 2019 Academic Planning Working Group report, so CAPRA also suggested that examples of "vision" be provided. Some CAPRA members suggested that "vision" be optional.
- CAPRA noted that the use of "values" differs from the Academic Planning Working Group report. Examples of "values" would be beneficial.
- For each goal, Schools/Divisions should provide their relationship to the Academic Planning Working Group's three components of campus mission, such that all three components are

addressed. In addition, Schools/Divisions should address one or more indices within the component.

- With regard to the language on additional measures, CAPRA suggests it be re-worded: “Any new measures must be contextualized with existing measures.”
- CAPRA noted that throughout the Draft Format for School/Division Five-Year Academic Plans and the Phase I Goal Submission and Alignment Matrix Guide there appears to be an ambiguous use of the phrase “indices of success” that does not align with the usage in the Academic Planning Working Group report. CAPRA recommends that both documents make clear the distinction between campus mission components, indices of success, and criteria and measures. A CAPRA member suggested that the Academic Planning Working Group report be reviewed again.

**Action:** CAPRA will send a memo to APAPB Schnier with the summary of recommended revisions to Phase I and II academic planning documents.

#### IV. Campus Review Item

##### A. Summer Session faculty compensation

Background: Last year the joint Senate-administration Budget Working Group reviewed the summer session compensation and revenue-sharing models for the campus and compared it to peer UC institutions. The group’s analysis concluded that the campus should consider replace the current Senate faculty salary cap of \$10,000 on summer session instructional remuneration to Senate faculty with a model that would incentivize Senate faculty participation in summer session teaching (should they wish).

The Senate is asked to comment on the Working Group’s proposed model for summer session faculty compensation. The intention is to implement the new model in time for faculty to consider their participation in the 2020 summer session.

**Action:** CAPRA identified a lead reviewer. The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed at the March 10 meeting. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Thursday, March 12.

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

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair