

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
March 10, 2020

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 11:00 am on March 10, 2020 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Academic Planning Phase I

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA received the academic planning Phase I aspirations and goals from the following Schools/Divisions: SNS, SSHA, SoE, Gallo School, Library, and the Graduate Division. Documents have not yet been received from Undergraduate Education.

After its consultation with APAPB Schnier in the last CAPRA meeting, the committee transmitted a memo to the APAPB regarding discrepancies in the terminology between documents he drafted for the phases of academic planning and the 2019 Academic Planning Work Group (APWG) report. APAPB Schnier stated in today's meeting that after consulting with EVC/Provost Camfield and CAPRA member - and former co-chair of the 2019 APWG - Trounstone, he revised the APWG report and will send it to CAPRA. The Phase I academic planning documents he previously shared with CAPRA will be revised accordingly. APAPB Schnier added that all academic planning documents will eventually be uploaded onto a website from the EVC/Provost's office.

APAPB Schnier asked CAPRA what information they need at this time in order for the committee to provide feedback to the Schools and Divisions on their Phase I academic planning submissions. Committee members acknowledged that CAPRA should be examining the documents through an institutional lens and focus on how Schools' and Divisions' goals are moving the institution forward. However, CAPRA members pointed out the difficulty of taking an institutional perspective in the absence of benchmarks. APAPB Schnier agreed and replied that he is working with the EVC/Provost on obtaining benchmarks to share with CAPRA. He also confirmed that this year, CAPRA will be making recommendations on the allocation of pots of money to Schools and Divisions to be used for faculty positions; in future years, the pots of money will include both faculty and staff positions. A CAPRA member suggested that the committee should consider establishing a consistent structure for making future academic planning recommendations to Schools and Divisions given the turnover rate on CAPRA.

CAPRA members then discussed whether the three indices of success are equal and whether at this stage in academic planning CAPRA should be giving Schools and Divisions feedback on their respective measures. Another committee member inquired about community engagement and outreach. APAPB Schnier responded that that was discussed in last year's APWG meetings but

ultimately did not rise to the level of priority of the other indices of success. He suggested that adding community engagement and outreach to the list of indices of success now may be disruptive to the process. APAPB Schnier suggested revisiting the issue in the future and discussing the addition of new measures. He also emphasized that measures have to be evaluated in a uniform, consistent manner across all Schools and Divisions in order to appropriately evaluate them from the institutional perspective.

CAPRA members asked APAPB Schnier about Phase II of academic planning. APAPB Schnier stated that he intends to speak to the EVC/Provost about details and planning.

CAPRA members continued discussing the type of feedback that would be useful to provide Schools and Divisions for their Phase I academic planning documents. Committee members recommended that APAPB Schnier share the spreadsheet that he created that compiled all Schools' and Divisions' Phase 1 aspirational goals and share with all Schools and Divisions for transparency. CAPRA recommends that Schools and Divisions should review each others' aspirational goals and assess how those goals map to the indices of success. Looking ahead to Phase II which is already underway, CAPRA also encourages Schools and Divisions to prioritize their goals.

Action: APAPB Schnier will share his document of compiled, Phase I aspirational goals with all Schools and Divisions. CAPRA will communicate, via APAPB Schnier, to Schools and Divisions that they should reflect on all aspirational goals, how they map to indices of success, and how they prioritize their goals.

II. Chair's Report

A. UCPB meeting March 3

The main topics of discussion included: Governor's proposed budget and funding for the UCs; conversations between the UCs and state legislators about student to faculty ratios; and ongoing reviews of multi-campus research units (MRUs).

B. Division Council meeting March 4

The main items of discussion included: 1) UCM administration appreciated CAPRA's suggestion that the campus locate additional funding for more UC Merced students to participate in the UCDC program and the Office of External Relations is now leading this initiative; UC Berkeley's proposal to UC Merced about admitting international undergraduate students to Berkeley's extension program then allowing them to transfer to UC Merced; and the emergency course continuity policy that was drafted by GC and UGC and referenced in a recent communication from the EVC/Provost to the campus community.

III. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's agenda
- B. Draft meeting minutes February 25

Action: Due to time constraints, this item will be addressed via email.

IV. Campus Committee Updates

- A. February 26 LASC meeting update

Action: Due to time constraints, this item will be tabled for the next meeting.

V. Request from Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE)

- A. At the request of CRE, Senate standing committees are invited to review their current bylaws and submit any requested revisions.

Action: Due to time constraints, this item will be addressed via email.

VI. Consultation with APAPB Schnier

- A. Transfer and first year retention model
- B. Conversion of temporary instructional support funds to permanent Senate faculty positions

Action: Due to time constraints, these items were tabled for a future meeting.

VII. 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.

CAPRA members were generally supportive of the policy with a few caveats. One area of concern may be the compensation for a course with under 15 students. If a faculty member's 9-month salary is low, it appears the proposed formula will allow them to make more money with 14 students than with a class of 15. CAPRA suggests that the EVC/Provost should consider scaling the compensation with salary regardless of below-threshold enrollment so that faculty are clear about the amount they are set to earn. CAPRA also suggests clarification to the faculty about exact amount of compensation they can expect for a course so as to not disadvantage them if students drop the course and perhaps even they gain more compensation if more students add the course. CAPRA members also wondered if the proposed policy is consistent with policies at other UC campuses.

Action: Committee analyst will distribute a revised, draft memo to committee members for review and approval. The final memo is 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