

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)**Minutes of Meeting****March 8, 2021**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on March 8, 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. Academic Planning Phase III Submissions

APAPB Schnier informed CAPRA members that he met with the deans about the phase III academic planning submissions. Originally, APAPB Schnier wanted deans to indicate their anticipated growth by entering a specific number into their submission spreadsheet. However, he acknowledged that such a number is too difficult for deans to calculate so he is removing that requirement for this phase. However, he will ask the deans to indicate which measures they are moving. APAPB Schnier also stated that he and Assistant EVC/Provost Martin have revised the submission spreadsheet and will share it with the deans and CAPRA. He is currently working on the different strategies that have arisen from academic planning to align them with strategic planning. The deadline for Schools and Divisions to submit their final academic plans to the EVC/Provost and CAPRA is May 14, 2021.

A CAPRA member asked how the strategic plan will be used, given that faculty have put a significant amount of time and effort formulating their academic plans. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that the strategic plan will help guide some campus resource allocation. APAPB Schnier added that it is important to acknowledge the connections between all the campus enterprises and the academic mission.

EVC/Provost Camfield requested CAPRA's feedback on a future campus budget call process. This idea partly arose from a separate conversation he held with Senate Vice Chair Westerling on how the administration would be able to fund new Schools, ORUs, and academic programs. EVC/Provost Camfield suggested to CAPRA that moving forward, until such time as there is a campus budget call, CAPRA should endorse all such proposals if the committee believes they contribute to the campus's goals; the administration would then determine how the proposed School, ORU, or academic program will be funded. He reiterated that the campus cannot remain stagnant and must grow. A CAPRA member suggested that the committee devise a ranking system for evaluating future proposals similar to the processed used at federal granting agencies. After evaluating future proposals to establish new Schools, ORUs, or academic

programs and deciding whether they contribute to the campus academic goals, CAPRA would transmit its rankings to the EVC/Provost who would then determine whether the proposed entity can be funded. EVC/Provost Camfield agreed with this approach.

A CAPRA member suggested there be a process where reviewers register “qualified” support. For example, a reviewer should be allowed to state that they support a particular proposal if it contributes to the campus academic goals, however, the reviewer would not support the proposal if it means giving up resources in certain other areas. It is important to keep in mind relative costs and trade-offs.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that the formulation of a future campus budget call would require input from all of Divisional Council as such a call would affect both undergraduate and graduate education, the campus research mission, etc. He plans to consult with Divisional Council on this process.

A CAPRA member asked for clarification on the granularity of the budget call. APAPB Schnier answered that budget calls will roll up from the departments to the Schools to the EVC/Provost under the umbrella of Academic Affairs. A CAPRA member asked how large capital projects (new buildings) will be integrated into the budget call. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that those projects are governed by state law and Regental policy. Large capital projects are multi-year processes that involve several stages of consultations with stakeholders, preliminary plans, needs assessments, etc. The campus is already working on the next campus buildings. He added that once the campus has academic and strategic planning in place, planning for large capital projects will be more effective because we can see which buildings will be needed in 5-10 years. EVC/Provost Camfield acknowledged that the integration between academic affairs and the division of Physical Operations, Planning and Development needs to improve. He wants a process that is transparent and predictable yet flexible.

B. UC Quality in Strategic Planning Documentation

At the last meeting, CAPRA members had serious concerns about the removal of “UC Quality” from various sections of strategic planning documentation. APAPB Schnier announced that he and Assistant EVC/Provost Martin have reinstated UC quality in the following two areas of the strategic planning document:

- Goal 1.2 “Increase the infrastructure and funding necessary to enhance **UC quality** research and creative activities.”
- Goal 2.1 “Grow and diversify **UC quality** educational opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students and the public.”

CAPRA members approved these revisions.

II. Chair's Report – Patti LiWang

A. March 2 UCPB meeting

- i. The UC retirement plan is well-funded due to the positive stock market.
- ii. Rebenching. Different UC campuses receive different amounts of money from rebenching (dollars received from the legislative side rather than through tuition). UCOP is trying to change the formula. Assuming the legislature does not provide sufficient funds, the main source of revenue may be non-resident student tuition. Given that this revenue source benefits the larger UC campuses, the discussion at systemwide involved ways for larger campuses to share their non-resident student tuition dollars with smaller campuses if at all possible.

A CAPRA member asked whether UCPB discussed a UC “wish list” of items it wants to be funded if additional money is coming via the next federal COVID relief bill. Chair LiWang confirmed there was no discussion of this; there was only a discussion of how the Governor’s proposed budget restores the UC budget to pre-pandemic levels.

III. Consent Calendar

- A. Today’s agenda
- B. Draft February 22 meeting minutes

Action: the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. Senate Vice Chair Report – *LeRoy Westerling*

- A. Updates on meeting with the Chancellor and EVC/Provost

Regarding academic planning and strategic planning, Senate Vice Chair Westerling emphasized to the Chancellor and EVC/Provost that the campus cannot have separate messages to the community (including policy makers) and the faculty. The messaging about the campus must be the same. If the administration makes changes to the strategic plan, then faculty must be given the opportunity to review the changes to ensure they are aligned with the academic plans. He added that APAPB Schnier is always willing to provide CAPRA with any financial information they need while evaluating proposals.

V. Campus Review Items

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

CAPRA discussed the lead reviewer’s comments. CAPRA has two areas of concern. First, the course rotation includes a faculty member who is not listed as a core CRES faculty member or a

faculty affiliate. CAPRA recommends that the faculty member be added to the list of affiliated faculty if she is to be expected to consistently teach for the CRES program. It would also be helpful to have a statement from the History faculty agreeing that the faculty member teach for the CRES program instead of the History program. Additionally, several courses are listed as taught by Interdisciplinary Humanities Graduate Students. It would be helpful to have a statement from the IH graduate group chair agreeing to this arrangement.

With these small additions, CAPRA would view the CRES proposal as resource neutral and offer endorsement.

CAPRA members approved the lead reviewer's draft memo.

Action: The committee analyst will transmit CAPRA's memo to the Senate Chair.

B. Proposal for a Major in Writing Studies

CAPRA discussed the lead reviewer's comments. Committee members agreed that overall, this major seems like a good addition to UCM being resource neutral and with the possibility of attracting students similarly to the Writing minor. A CAPRA member questioned whether it was unusual to have a major offered by only Teaching Professors rather than "research faculty". She was concerned that the administrative tasks required by managing a major (e.g. PLOs) would be burdensome on Teaching Professors and unit 18 lecturers who already carry a large teaching load. Another CAPRA member pointed out that another program on campus is already managed by Teaching Professors.

Action: The committee analyst will distribute the lead reviewer's draft memo to CAPRA members for review and approval via email. The analyst will transmit CAPRA's final memo to the Senate Chair by Wednesday, March 31.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

A. Presidential Policy on Classification of Gifts and Sponsored Awards

This policy is intended to replace the UC Policy on Review of Gifts and Grants for Research. The UC has seen a significant increase in external support in the recent decade – especially from private foundations (including family foundations) and corporations. Though key concepts remain the same, the proposed policy provides greater clarity for properly classifying private support in contemporary circumstances.

Action: CAPRA identified a lead reviewer. The lead reviewer's comments will be discussed at the

the March 29 CAPRA meeting. CAPRA's comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Monday, April 12.

VII. Other Business

CAPRA Chair LiWang previously decided that CAPRA does not need to opine on the proposed, new MAPP 500 that pertains to recruitment. She recently received input from a faculty member who expressed serious concerns about the negative impact that MAPP 500 would have on faculty's ability to hire postdocs and research specialists.

Action: Chair LiWang will take the faculty member's input into consideration and will advise CAPRA on whether the committee should opine on the proposed, new MAPP 500.

VIII. Executive Session – voting members only
No minutes were recorded.

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

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair