

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 17, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 2:30 pm on September 17, 2013 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

I. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The committee approved the agenda pending the addition of one item: the visit of new UC President Janet Napolitano to UC Merced. The September 3 minutes were approved as presented.

CAPRA briefly discussed the issues it would like the Senate to impart to President Napolitano: lack of funding in light of the divestiture of state funds, possible sources of non-state funding, and the implications of budget cuts for a growing campus. It is also imperative to mention the uniqueness of this campus and the many space challenges we have as we move towards becoming a full-fledged UC campus. It is difficult to recruit high-quality faculty and graduate students due to our lack of space and resources. UC Merced needs continued support from UCOP.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley updated the committee on what transpired at the September 10 Division Council meeting:

--UC PATH. Michael Reese (Interim VC for Business and Administrative Services) and Dan Feitelberg (VC for Planning and Budget) gave an update on the project. Implementation has been challenging and there may be a delay in implementation of up to a year for UC Merced. Since UC Merced's financial systems are closely tied to UCLA's, UC Merced will implement UC PATH on the same schedule as UCLA.

--New MOU. The Provost and Chancellor have been drafting a new MOU to replace the expired agreement. The Provost has not yet released the draft for review.

III. Physics Graduate Group Proposal

Prior to this meeting, two CAPRA members provided written comments. CAPRA discussed both reviews and agreed that the Physics program is ready to move forward in terms of size and the quality of faculty and students. The program will survive as it grows at whichever rate is dictated by resources.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo to the Senate chair on behalf of CAPRA with both sets of reviews.

IV. Draft Course Buyout Policy

CAPRA members agreed that buying out one course per year is reasonable. However, there was dissension among committee members surrounding the provision that faculty members must teach an undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major. Some committee members pointed out that a graduate program may be negatively impacted by faculty members not teaching graduate courses, especially since graduate courses cannot be taught by lecturers. Moreover, the decision of what level of courses faculty members should teach ought to be left to the individual programs rather than mandated in a policy.

However, other committee members pointed out the importance of high-quality faculty teaching undergraduate courses and were in favor of the stipulation that faculty members must teach one undergraduate course.

CAPRA also discussed the difficulty of recruiting high-quality senior faculty who have large grants and are able to buy out their academic year salary; UC Merced is unable to let them do this and that places the campus at a disadvantage for recruiting.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo to the Senate chair on behalf of CAPRA listing the committee's comments. The memo will note that the committee was not unanimous in its opinion.

V. SACAP revised charge.

CAPRA members briefly discussed the revised charge and had no comments.

ACTION: CAPRA analyst will draft a memo to the Senate chair on behalf of CAPRA stating that the committee has no comments.

VI. FTE Requests

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed the last two years of CAPRA's FTE assessment criteria with the goal of deciding this year's criteria to suggest to Provost Peterson.

The AY 12-13 criteria was quite prescriptive and mandated that FTE requests should come from the graduate groups. The main problem with this requirement is that faculty members are not appointed to or hired by graduate groups; they are hired by Bylaw 55 units. Moreover, there is a lack of alignment between graduate groups and Bylaw 55 units. Another problem lies in the requirement that graduate groups must request LPSOE lines when LPSOEs do not engage in research. CAPRA wants to ensure that graduate groups are appropriately represented in the process. Some groups ignored CAPRA's directive last year and submitted FTE requests from Bylaw 55 units. Last year's CAPRA criteria also dictated how Schools should conduct their rankings of the FTE requests.

The AY 11-12 criteria were non-prescriptive and did not specify how Schools should arrive at their rankings.

In addition to discussing this year's CAPRA criteria of assessing FTE requests, the committee also debated on what exactly CAPRA should ask the Schools to submit. At a minimum, CAPRA wants the FTE rankings and justification from both the Deans and the faculty. The question amongst CAPRA still remains: how much documentation does CAPRA want from the Schools? A CAPRA member mentioned that it would be useful to see statistics on number of faculty as well as undergraduate and graduate

enrollment. Another CAPRA member suggested allowing both graduate groups and Bylaw 55 units to submit FTE requests.

In the past, Schools submitted its Strategic Plans to CAPRA and the Provost. CAPRA members inquired whether the Provost still intends to require these plans in light of his emphasis on “strategic focusing” of the campus. If the Provost intends request the School Strategic Plans, perhaps CAPRA could use those Plans in its evaluation of FTE requests rather than require a separate document from the Schools. If the Provost does not request Strategic Plans, then CAPRA will have to decide what specific documentation it will ask the Schools to provide.

CAPRA members also discussed the timeline of FTE requests and the importance of beginning the process early.

The committee then held a brief discussion on how to work with the Provost on the process for new versus replacement FTEs. In the past, when a faculty member left the University, groups were able to re-hire on the same FTE and in the same or similar discipline. Last year, it was suggested that replacement FTEs were not automatic and that justification for re-hiring in the same or similar discipline needed to be submitted by the groups. This led to some confusion and groups began to include requests for both new and replacement FTEs. While the Provost controls this process, CAPRA must seek clarification on whether it should evaluate only new FTE requests or both new and replacement FTEs. A CAPRA member suggested that the committee could comment on both but at different times, since the process for new FTEs occurs in a different cycle than the process for replacement FTEs.

ACTION: CAPRA will ask the Provost if he intends to require the Schools to submit Strategic Plans this year. This item will be placed on the agenda for continued discussion at the next CAPRA meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst