

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)****Minutes of Meeting****May 10, 2021**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on May 10, 2021, via Zoom. Chair Patricia LiWang presiding.

I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Camfield and Interim CFO Schnier

A. Senate involvement in the future campus budget call

Interim CFO Schnier continued his discussion from the last CAPRA meeting on his comparative research about how other UC CAPRAs/Senate are involved in their campus budget calls. UC Santa Cruz's CAPRA reviews all budget requests and makes recommendations based on whether the requests fulfill the campus mission. Their recommendations roll up to the appropriate Vice Chancellor who takes CAPRA's advice into account when he/she makes decisions. UC Davis does not review all budget requests at one time. Instead, they conduct meetings with each School and Division along with the CFO, Provost, and School Executive Committee representative and discuss the budget requests. Their recommendations roll up centrally. Davis's Senate does not review the budget requests when they roll up centrally. UC Berkeley's Senate consultation is similar to that of Santa Cruz but not as heavy. UCLA's model is decentralized and involves the department chairs. UC San Diego's Provost and CFO meet with Senate leadership to discuss academic priorities before the budget call process begins.

A CAPRA member stated that the UC San Diego model of delegation to Senate leadership would work well assuming the Senate is unified and faculty are comfortable with that year's Senate leadership. It would require a consultative process on the Senate leadership side whereby the Senate leadership meets prior to meeting the administration to ensure the Senate leadership agrees on academic priorities. This model may not work well if there is a divergence of opinion among the Senate leadership. Another CAPRA member pointed out that the balance between committees and Divisional Council tends to shift year to year and certain items that a committee would normally handle itself one year may be under Divisional Council's purview another year. Interim CFO Schnier suggested that Senate leadership and the administration could discuss the process for the future campus budget call at the annual Senate/Administration retreat in late summer/early fall.

With regard to the UC San Diego budget model, a CAPRA member pointed out that initial consultation between the administration and Senate leadership is not a substitute for a consultation after all budget requests have been submitted in which the Senate makes

recommendations on spending. Interim CFO Schnier replied that it is an issue of scale: having the Senate review all budget requests would be burdensome and too time consuming as UC Merced grows. However, campus may be able to do it now. A CAPRA member supported this and suggested that meetings between the Senate and the administration on evaluating budget requests do not need to be long or detailed. EVC/Provost Camfield echoed Interim CFO Schnier's suggestion that the Senate leadership and administration should discuss this further at the annual Senate/Administrative retreat later this year.

A CAPRA member asked Interim CFO Schnier how he would characterize UC Merced's budget process in relation to other UC campuses. Schnier answered that the Merced is most similar to UCLA with a decentralized budget process and administrative authority. A CAPRA member suggested that in order to avoid fatigue and constantly reinventing the process, that the campus should think in increments.

A CAPRA member stated that CAPRA would need to first see what the budget call looks like before it can judge how the Senate/CAPRA would want to be involved.

#### B. ORU Proposal

Today's agenda included a hyperlink to the following correspondence:

- i. Divisional Council's February 9 memo to EVC/Provost Camfield and Interim VCORED Zatz on the review of the Community and Labor Center ORU proposal.
- ii. EVC/Provost Camfield, Interim VCORED Zatz, and Interim CFO Schnier's April 5 response memo.
- iii. Divisional Council's May 3 memo to EVC/Provost Camfield, Interim VCORED Zatz, and Interim CFO Schnier.

EVC/Provost Camfield informed CAPRA members that Interim VCORED Zatz is researching various aspects of the ORUs on other UC campuses. It is a difficult task given the variety of mechanisms and academic fields. EVC/Provost Camfield announced that his office is developing a proposal pertaining to the ORUs this summer and will submit that proposal to the Senate for review in the next academic year. A CAPRA member pointed out that the campus still does not have a definition for a "self-supporting" ORU. EVC/Provost Camfield stated that if the campus has the appropriate indirect cost return model, it would be possible to create incentives for faculty to pursue more external grants. The campus could encourage synergies of dynamic research while simultaneously removing the burden from faculty in other areas to leave them more time to seek extramural funding.

After the EVC/Provost and Interim CFO left the meeting, a CAPRA member stated that with regard to the current Community and Labor Center ORU proposal, CAPRA has no way of knowing whether their requested budget is appropriate or not in the absence of information from the

administration (information that was requested by Divisional Council but never received). CAPRA members agreed and stated that faculty have a lot of critical needs and the campus has to balance priorities, e.g. determine how to fund a new ORU while addressing faculty's other needs.

**Action:** CAPRA members will raise this issue again with the EVC/Provost in AY 21-22.

II. Chair's Report – *Patti LiWang*

A. Divisional Council meeting April 30

Two of the main topics of discussion were the issues surrounding the BSP building and the consternation about the proposed MAPP 500. Senate Vice Chair Westerling stated that in his meeting with Assistant VPAP Anders, she informed him that the goal is to align the MAPP with the APM. However, he heard from colleagues at the systemwide level that their campuses do not follow the process that is being proposed in MAPP 500. UC Merced faculty are extremely concerned at the obstacles proposed in the new policy.

B. UCPB meeting May 4

The state budget is more positive than originally thought. The UC has been asked to make new budget requests. The UC has requested, among other items, a 3% raise for faculty and non-represented staff. There is a request from state leadership to increase online course offerings by 10% from pre-pandemic norms. UC President Drake is in favor of this request, but some faculty are concerned about their autonomy over their pedagogy.

C. Joint Council

Interim VPDGE Kello gave a presentation on 10 rules to establishing an anti-racist graduate program which was viewed positively by the Council.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Today's agenda

B. Draft April 26 meeting minutes

**Action:** the Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

A. Proposed Presidential Policy SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program

This policy would require students, faculty, academic appointees, and staff who are accessing campus facilities at a UC location beginning this Fall to be immunized against SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19.

A CAPRA member pointed out that the campus will have to make accommodations for individuals who refuse to be vaccinated which will create resource needs. CAPRA selected a lead reviewer.

**Action:** The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed via email. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Monday, May 17.

B. Proposed Presidential Policy – Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration

The revisions of the policy would permit Deans to establish “a local campus region within which in absentia registration will not be considered” instead of limiting eligibility to students studying outside of California.

CAPRA members agreed that defining residency for graduate students is important, but it is also crucial to define it for faculty and staff. The whole policy should be reconsidered in light of the pandemic. CAPRA selected a lead reviewer.

**Action:** The lead reviewer’s comments will be discussed by the committee via email. CAPRA’s comments are due to the Senate Chair by 5:00 pm on Monday, May 24.

V. Other Business

A. Evaluation of Proposals for Academic Programs/Schools/ORUs

In previous meetings, CAPRA members discussed the idea of developing an internal ranking system for the committee’s review of future proposals for new Schools, ORUs, and academic programs. In today’s meeting, CAPRA members reconsidered this idea, as it would be difficult for the committee to develop such a ranking system without seeing what the campus budget call and School and Division academic plans look like and having no knowledge of the opportunity costs presented by each proposal. CAPRA finds it very difficult to review new proposals on a one-off basis and would prefer to review several proposals at the same time. This would require the campus to create a timeline for the submission of proposals for new Schools, ORUs, and academic programs.

CAPRA members stated that the committee does not know what to expect in the final academic plans which Schools and Divisions are scheduled to submit to the EVC/Provost and CAPRA by May 14. Members suggested that cross-School ORU proposals and cross-School strategic investments should roll up from the VCORED’s office and proposals for new Schools should emanate from the Schools’ five-year academic plans. CAPRA should review the proposals in the context of their “home” unit so that the committee can evaluate their intellectual merit and whether the proposal aligns with the campus’s academic and strategic planning goals.

CAPRA members agreed that the committee should perhaps not commit itself to developing an internal ranking system for the evaluation of proposals of new Schools, ORUs, and academic programs at this time. CAPRA will revisit this issue when it sees the campus budget call and the School and Division academic plans.

A CAPRA member suggested possible review criteria for proposals for new Schools, ORUs, and academic programs: 1) aligns with campus strategic priorities; 2) equity: serves currently unserved faculty constituencies; and 3) opportunity for growth/meaningful funding/high profile research/community engagement.

A CAPRA member asked about the status of the Senate's review of the current Community and Labor Center ORU proposal. Since CAPRA has agreed it cannot evaluate the proposal independent of the Schools' academic plans, and those plans are not being submitted until May 14 and reviewed by CAPRA in fall 2021, will it be too late for CAPRA to provide meaningful feedback on the proposal? Another CAPRA member answered that Divisional Council voted not to move the ORU proposal forward in the absence of funding information that it requested from the administration. He added that the Center can continue operating as a center and is not being negatively impacted by the absence of ORU status.

B. LASC memo on Library budget cuts

At the request of the Senate Chair, CAPRA members reviewed LASC's memo to the Senate Chair about the need to shield the Library's budget from further cuts. A CAPRA member stated that LASC should not operate as an extension of the Library's advocacy efforts. All units and Schools are experiencing short term budget cuts and CAPRA has no role to play in that situation. A possible solution would be to incorporate a formula into the budget that factors in the number of students, faculty, and the number of academic programs of a specific type to arrive at a number that the Library knows it needs to have added to their budget. This would assure the Library that they will have some budget increase as the campus grows. And when faculty are developing proposals, the burden that is currently placed on them to determine their proposed programs' impact on the Library is reduced because the Library would already know it will receive an increment of funding for the new program being proposed.

A CAPRA member stated that CAPRA could simply recommend that the Library budget does not get cut, but it is unclear what impact that will have on other unit and Schools' budgets. Will other units have to take larger cuts to make up the difference? CAPRA lacks information about the Library's budget.

**Action:** CAPRA will submit a memo to the Senate Chair in response to LASC's memo about the Library's budget.

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

Attest: Patti LiWang, CAPRA chair