AY 2008-2009 CAPRA AGENDAS & MINUTES

- September 15, 2008
- September 29, 2008
- October 20, 2008
- November 3, 2008
- November 17, 2008
- December 8, 2008
- January 5, 2009 (No minutes-Executive session only)
- January 26, 2006
- February 9, 2009 (Minutes not ready)
- March 2, 2009 (Minutes not ready)

From: Nancy Clarke [mailto:nclarke@ucmerced.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 8:55 AM
To: 'eheit@ucmerced.edu'; 'mcolvin@ucmerced.edu'; 'poday@ucmerced.edu'; 'vleppert@ucmerced.edu'
Cc: 'fpaul@ucmerced.edu'
Subject: (CAPRA) Meeting Reminder

Dear CAPRA Members,

The first CAPRA meeting of the year will take place on:

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2008
2:00 pm. to 3:30 p.m.
324KL

AGENDA

I. Review of Last Year's CAPRA Recommendations
II. Schedule for Review of School Plans for 2008-2009
III. Other CAPRA Plans for 2008-2009
IV. EVC/Provost Alley – Discussion of School's Faculty Line Allocations (Please see attached letters distributed to the School Deans.)

Eventually (soon!) you will be able to access this information on *ucmcrops*.

I invite you to visit the Senate's website where you will find the committee rosters (CAPRA's will be revised today) and meeting dates. http://senate.ucmerced.edu

Regards,

Nancy

Nancy Clarke, Senate Director
Academic Senate, Merced Division
(209) 228-7954

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
September 15, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:00 p.m. on September 15, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. EVC/Provost Keith Alley

- EVC Alley met with UC President Mark Yudof. The budget and planning officers, EVCs, and Chancellors say they will continue to support UC Merced next year.
- UC Merced is being given more money for Science & Engineering II and we are making progress on getting the building bigger. It will open in 2012 or 2013.
- President Yudof has proposed a $2 billion bond issue that would create lease revenue bonds for capital development for UC. The bond would be for building UC Merced and for seismic retrofits for UC Berkeley and UCLA.
- We need $82 million a year, rather than every 5 years, to continue building UC Merced.
- A committee member mentioned the problem of hiring lecturers. EVC Alley explained that it is a problem of money. As we fill more of the faculty lines, we'll have fewer dollars to spend on lecturers.
- There was some discussion about graduate students experiencing payroll challenges due to confusion between the Schools and Academic Personnel. TA allocation is also a problem.

III. School Plans

- The draft of the Strategic Academic Plan is almost complete. It needs to go to the steering committee and subcommittees. The Academic Senate will also be sent a copy for review.
- EVC Alley said that revising the process for how the Schools request faculty lines might be a year away, after campus-wide Strategic Academic Planning has proceeded further. The next two pieces of the process are to come up with a business plan and to decide what tactics we are going to use.
- EVC Alley stated that if we had clarity about the budget next year knowing we would get full marginal cost that would backfill everything, maybe we will get all 24 faculty positions.
- A committee member mentioned that the School of Management proposal is not yet ready for review. EVC Alley suggestedthere is too much focus on MBA and

Executive MBA. We should focus on starting an undergraduate program then building a couple of specialty areas such as entrepreneurship and natural resources management. EVC Alley indicated that he has no imminent plans to launch searches for three unfilled faculty lines in Management.

IV. Other CAPRA Plans

- Chair Heit reviewed CAPRA's duties as outlined on the Academic Senate website. Last year, the committee established documentation on how UGC would work with CAPRA and the EVC to approve new programs.
- Concerns were raised about strategic planning for the planned growth at the undergraduate level. Teaching and lab space may be exhausted in about a year. As we allocate future faculty positions, we have to reconcile what the graduate groups and Schools are asking for with the lack of space.
- We should examine which majors the students are flowing into to determine where the immediate chokepoints are, e.g., the life sciences majors and lack of lab space. Enrollment in some majors may have to be limited, but there is no mechanism for doing that. This could affect all students on campus: for General Education courses, students take science classes with labs. This will be a problem as lab space reaches capacity. This is also a UGC issue. Chair Heit recommended that the Natural Sciences faculty send a memo to Divisional Council, to detail these concerns and initiate Senate review.
- There was discussion on how to address the issue of re-directing students out of the life sciences and into other majors. One issue raised was that students who ought to change majors or schools may have too low a GPA to do so. A committee member suggested speaking to other UC campuses to learn what their procedures are. This seems to be an issue for UGC.
- A committee member inquired about staff support for faculty and who determines when more staff is needed.
- Chair Heit suggested that he and Professor Conklin will participate in President Yudof's question time with the Academic Council and systemwide budget officers with UCPB, to raise Merced budget issues.
- Once CAPRA has some specific findings on issues like hiring and space, committee members could attend a Divisional Council meeting and present the data and recommendations to Chancellor Kang.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, September 29, 2008, 2:15 – 3:45PM

Room 326 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 9/29/2008

AGENDA

Action	Item
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Evan Heit** ▪ Final report of CAPRA, 07-08
Action	**II. Consent Calendar** ▪ Draft Minutes, September 15, 2008
Action	**III. Action Item** ▪ Approval of CAPRA criteria and timeline for strategic planning
Discussion	**IV. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00PM)** ▪ Strategic Planning ▪ Budget ▪ Capital Planning
Discussion	**V. Discussion Items:** ▪ UCM Budget *-President Yudof Letter to Academic Council regarding UCM Funding* ▪ Capital Planning *-State Funded Capital Improvement Program ~ Division Council asked CAPRA to analyze data. Chart was provided by Chair Conklin and was distributed at the 9/22 CPPC meeting* *- UCM Major Capital Improvement Projects~ Document provided by Professor Wallander* ▪ School of Management Proposal *(Comments due to Divco by 11/21/08)* ▪ Strategic Academic Planning
Discussion	**VI. Members' Items**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
September 29, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:15 p.m. on September 29, 2008, in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Prior to today's meeting, Chair Heit and Senate Chair Conklin briefly met with VCA Miller to discuss space issues, regarding SEII in particular.

CAPRA's Faculty Lines Recommendations

Every year CAPRA generates a set of recommendations on allocation of faculty lines across the three Schools. The consensus of the committee was that those recommendations should be readily accessible to faculty to better assist them when planning their programs in regards to faculty lines.

Action: Senate staff will contact IT to help create a link on the senate website.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the September 15th Meeting we approved.

IV. Approval of CAPRA Criteria and Timeline for Strategic Planning

The committee slightly edited and approved its 2008-2009 timeline and criteria for reviewing the schools strategic plans (it now includes a "cc" to the chairs of the graduate groups). Revised documents will be available on the senate website: http://senate.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lvl2=25&lvl3=25&lvl4=26&contentid=50)

Action: Timeline and criteria will be forwarded to the EVC/Provost for distribution to faculty, deans of the schools and graduate groups chairs.

V. Discussion Items

This semester CAPRA is being asked to review the School of Management proposal and two documents for the Strategic Academic Planning. There is no procedure in place to conduct these kinds of reviews, so CAPRA first considered its own procedures.

School of Management Proposal (SOM)

CAPRA will consider the resource aspects in the proposal. Other senate committees (UGC and GRC) will address the curricular questions.

Professors Conklin (senate chair) and Leppert (GRC chair) agreed to review the SOM proposal. Their analysis will be discussed at a future CAPRA meeting. They will also report to CAPRA whether they will need outside resources or consultants.

Strategic Academic Planning (SAP)

The resource section in the SAP documents is not specific enough to enable CAPRA to carry out a detailed analysis, but it will be possible to raise questions and general planning issues.

Review assignments for the SAP are as follows:

- SAP: Chair Heit and Professor David Kelley
- SAP Organizational Structure: Professors Colvin and Martin-Rodriguez

Analysis of the SAP documents will be discussed at the October 20th meeting. The School of Management analysis will be discussed on November 3rd.

CAPRA would like to encourage the Division Council to establish some guidance on evaluating the Strategic Plan when it is widely distributed the faculty. CAPRA also recommends that the Division Council send a memo to the campus listing the senate's major concerns and soliciting faculty input. The Division Council will discuss and review the SAP documents at its October 6th meeting.

Capital Planning

Handouts: Merced Campus 2009 to 2018 Combined Capital Program
2008-2014 State-Funded Capital Improvement Program

The Division Council asked CAPRA to opine on some documents related to capital planning (*State Funded Capital Improvement Program* and *UCM Major Capital Improvement Projects*) provided by the Office of Capital Planning.

Each year, the University submits a report to UCOP which provides a descriptive overview of unfunded campus capital needs (state-funded and non state-funded). The Campus Physical Planning Committee (CPPC) is responsible for identifying the space and capital needs of the campus and recommending a prioritized list of projects for inclusion in the state Capital Improvement Program. The focus of the State CIP is on instruction and research. The non-state CIP covers facility needs such as housing, parking, recreation and other non-academic needs.

CAPRA raised the following concerns:

- Faculty had little voice in the creation of this report
- Amount of teaching and research space is a major concern for faculty
- Enrollment-based funding is not adequate nor a reliable source of funding for UCM given the small number of students (compared to other UCs)

- Caps on course enrollment due to room size make it difficult to estimate the true demand or optimal room size for courses
- The administration is conferring with UCOP to expand the size of SE II which would have about 55,000 ASF (to be available for AY 2012). Even with the opening of SE2, there would still be a substantial space shortage.

Last year CAPRA had requested some quantitative data analyses and projections for instructional space from the office of the Registrar to help the committee identify areas where demands are most critical. That information was not readily available due to the need for a software to perform the study. It was agreed that UGC will take the lead in obtaining this information.

VI. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley

Chair Heit informed the EVC that the committee slightly revised and approved its criteria and timeline for reviewing the Schools strategic plans. Those documents will be forwarded to the EVC/Provost. CAPRA encouraged the EVC/Provost to widely distribute those documents.

EVC/Provost Alley reported on the following items:

- In order to ensure consistency across the three Schools, the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis will perform calculations for faculty workload, table of majors, breakdowns by discipline/major/prefix etc. that are required in the strategic plans
- Infrastructure expenses (electrical, sewer etc.) are high and are hurting UCM's operating budget
- UCOP is considering a lease revenue bond to meet UCM's space needs
- There has been a lot of debate about the space use at Castle. It is not clear which programs will be assigned there. The best scenario would be to assign those that have some cohesion to Castle
- The space committee is currently being assembled. CAPRA will be informed of the progress
- UCM needs $82 million per year in capital funding until 2020. We are currently receiving about $82 million every five years.
- The office of Student Affairs surveyed the School Dean's offices to inquire about their space needs

Space for AY 09-10

The EVC/Provost reported that space will be a major issue for any new hire and for students. Assignments of office and lab spaces will be done by the deans of the Schools. He also noted that there is some space available in SEI and at the Castle campus. The administration is engaged in discussions to lease some space off campus, at the Mondo

building downtown and underneath the parking lot on 18th street in Merced. That space can be used within the next year.

CAPRA members reiterated their concern about current and future space challenges. It was noted that in order to fully address and visualize the space problems the committee needs detailed reports and analyses from the office of the Registrar and/or the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis. Furthermore, there is a disconnect between actual space needs at UCM and the university's inadequate capital budget. According to OP, CPEC analyses do not justify larger buildings at UCM. UCOP standards for assessment and analyses of UCM needs for space are below those of other UCs. This concerns CAPRA given the current space crisis. Committee members noted that UCOP also needs to take into consideration the fact that remedial education occupies a large amount of space.

CAPRA would like to get estimates of classroom projections on a yearly basis, during precise intervals of time, in terms of percentage of students, majors and instructional labs. In regards to the schools strategic plans, the committee agreed that it will be important to collect information from the deans about their schools space needs.

Letter from President Yudof

CAPRA and the EVC discussed the letter from President Yudof, in response to a memo from then-Academic Council Chair Brown regarding UCPB's recommendation to reconsider and increase UC Merced current capital and operating budget. The UCM senate will draft a response to President Yudof's letter. In its memo, the senate will consider the following points:

- There is a fundamental unfairness in the current funding model
- UCM is running out on capacity to take on more loans
- Level of funding needed to build a research university is disproportionate with current UCM operating and capital budget
- Current budget and instructional space cannot accommodate 5000 students
- Every acre being developed costs the campus 1 to 2 million dollars in infrastructure expenses
- UCM is getting 50% less funding per student from the Legislature (UCB receives $20,000 per year, per graduate student)
- UCM's per capita block grants are lower than the other campuses
- Castle campus will need to be upgraded to help faculty and student conduct research

CAPRA would like to be knowledgeable about the nature of the administration's strategy when addressing current and future budget and space issues.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 20th.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, October 20, 2008, 2:15 – 3:45PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 10/20/2008

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Evan Heit** ▪ Student Representative Kevin Wolff ▪ UCPB Meeting report, October 7, 2008	
Action	**II. Consent Calendar** ▪ Draft Minutes, September 29, 2008	1-5
Discussion	**III. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00)** ▪ Strategic Academic Planning ▪ Budget ▪ Resources for General Education ▪ Space, and Campus Space Committee ▪ Faculty Lines released in 08-09	
Discussion	**IV. Discussion Items:**	
	A. Strategic Academic Planning	6-7
	- Chair Heit and Professor Kelley to comment on the "Vision" of the SAP [draft to be circulated] *- Professors Colvin and Martin-Rodriguez will address the "Organizational Structure"* [draft to be circulated]	
	B. General Education	8-9
	*UGC asked CAPRA to comment on resource implications of the plan for General Education – [Draft CAPRA comments: CAPRA 2008-09/Meeting Agendas&Handouts/MTG 10-20-08/**General Education** folder]*	
	C. Capital Planning	10
	*Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the State-Funded Capital Improvement Program – [Preliminary comments available on crops: CAPRA 2008-09/Meeting Agendas&Handouts/MTG10-20-08/**CAPRA Comments on State-Funded CIP**]- Additional material available at: CAPRA 2008-09/**Capital Planning** folder*	
	D. Classroom Space	11-12
	Memo posted on crops in the 10/20/08 meeting folder	
	E. Senate Letter to Academic Council re President Yudof memo on UCM Funding	
	The Senate office has requested some data from the EVC.	

Discussion **V. Members' Items**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, October 20, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:15 p.m. on October 20, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Heit welcomed Student Representative Kevin Wolff. It was agreed that at *the next CAPRA meeting*, the committee will hold an executive session from 2:15 until 2:30. Kevin will join CAPRA at 2:30.

UCPB October 7 Meeting

Chair Heit updated members on the following:

- Associate Vice President for Budget Operations Debra Obley updated UCPB members on the status of the UC and state budgets.
- UC will be making fairly aggressive requests to the state. The UC system will be asking for backfill on enrollment support last year which it didn't get from the state. The UC system will also be asking for an increase for enrollment for next year which could potentially benefit UC Merced.
- The UC system will be impacted by mid-year cuts.
- The state is having problems borrowing money so it is going to pay its bills late to its constituents like the UC system. This means UC Merced will drain its short-term investments sooner than usual, requiring budget cuts.
- Last year, there was a lot of support for UC Merced's budget at systemwide Council. This year the budget cuts at other campuses will be very salient. It is important that UCM work with the new Senate Chair, Mary Croughan.

Letter from the UC Merced Senate to Chair Croughan re: UC Merced Funding

- The Senate is preparing a letter in response to President Yudof's letter on UC Merced funding, dated September 3, 2008.
- UC Merced is requesting that Council reaffirms last year's UCPB and Council recommendations, which were to increase our base funding per student, restore the Science & Engineering II building in terms of square footage, expand Castle, and work with UCM to come up with a sustainable budget for the campus.
- Senate Chair Croughan will attend the December 4 Merced Division meeting. President Yudof will not attend.
- CAPRA feels it is important that Yudof visit the campus. A committee member noted that Yudof attended the Trustees meeting last week.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the September 29th meeting were approved.

IV. Strategic Academic Planning

Comments are available on crops.

"Vision" document – Version 5.0

- Chair Heit and Professor Kelley reviewed the 5.0 version of the plan. Their comments were circulated within CAPRA prior to today's meeting and were reviewed during today's meeting.
- CAPRA did not perform a complete resource analysis. The committee's comments are general and target the needs of the campus and its strategic directions.
- The document presents research themes - Environmental Sustainability, Human Health, Cognitive and Information Sciences and Management, World Heritage and Social Sustainability and Justice - as the university's research initiatives. CAPRA would like to know how much we are going to put into these themes versus everything else. Also, what does it mean to excel outside of the themes? How broadly will these be defined?
- Material in the undergraduate section is too abstract and unclear.
- The document suggests coming up with new majors based on the themes or new tracks within the majors. That process should reflect the faculty's research interests rather than making faculty bound by research themes.
- CAPRA is not clear as to why the Association of American Universities (AAU) is mentioned without an explicit statement about UC Merced's position in regards to AAU. The question was raised of whether there is trade-off between localism and national research standing.
- UC Merced was warned against localism in a CAP memo addressed to EVC/Provost Alley and then-Senate chair Kantor. See CAPRA 3/20/08 meeting folder on crops.

  Background:
  - Last year, five external CAP members warned the UC Merced administration against the danger of localism. This was addressed in a memo (see CAPRA 3/20/08).
  - It appears that the higher administration at UC Merced considers one of the campus' major missions is to promote studies relevant to the San Joaquin Valley and Sierras. However, unless such studies produce scholarship relevant to broad, international fields of inquiry, stress on local studies is directly contrary to the UC mission as the CAP members understand it.
  - Some members feel that the UC Merced administration focuses excessively on local and regional issues and that it encourages

faculty to use the region as their research labs. It was acknowledged that this may be appropriate for some research fields; however it is not relevant for some faculty who are engaged in research areas that may not find the region useful. It was noted that faculty who conduct research that does not directly involve regional resources feel discouraged, and that their scholarship might be compromised.

- These CAP comments will be added to DivCo's final comments on the SAP.
- There was some discussion about professional schools and what the standards are for a UC-quality professional school as opposed to a professional school that could be at any public university. UC Merced needs adequate resources to build a UC-quality professional school. We also need to justify why we are adding a professional school and point out UC Merced's unique identity.

Action: Draft will be re-circulated within CAPRA for comments. Final draft will be sent to the Division Council by Wednesday, October 22nd.

Academic Organizational Structure - Version 3.0

- Professors Colvin and Martin-Rodriguez reviewed the 3.0 version of the plan.
- The document doesn't come to any conclusion about the number and scope of Schools. But that issue can't be resolved without a more complete cost analysis. Also, it is premature to consider restructuring because there is too much uncertainty in the direction and magnitude of our growth.
- The plan does seem to reach a consensus on the recommended Bylaw 55 units. Each unit is responsible for delivering some degree at either the undergraduate or graduate level. That is the main characteristic of these Bylaw 55 units. They are the building blocks.
- The draft suggests a series of modifications to the strategic plan. There is a reference to "a self assessment of disciplinary research performance". There is no need for that to be part of a resource allocation request. Also, it might lead to a process in the future where groups are allocated resources based on how many papers they publish.
- A committee member expressed concern about the lack of structure on the administration side for reviewing things like the formulation of a Bylaw 55 unit or a plan for General Education. There was some discussion about FTE allocations and the powers of the Deans and EVC/Provost.

Action: Professor Colvin will send his comments to CAPRA after today's meeting. They will send their comments to Senate Chair Conklin for the letter she is putting together. Final comments will be sent to EVC/Provost Alley by October 27th.

IV. <u>Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley</u>

EVC/Provost Alley reported on the following:

Budget

- UC will get a 4 to 5% cut.
- If UCM's budget remains the same, we still have the $5 million that we lose next year from the state plus the $6.3 million that's in play that came from the other campuses this year. The campuses have all said that they will be supportive of us, but it is unclear we will receive another $6.3 million from them next year when they, too, are being affected by the 5% cut. Hence, we would not get enrollment dollars for the next increment of students that we would take next year.
- A committee member pointed out that at the recent UCPB meeting, it was mentioned that the system is asking the state for more enrollment support for next year.
- A committee member stated that when our administration meets with its counterparts at OP, it needs to convey that we can't run a quality university with this level of funding.
- UC Merced's problem is space modeling. EVC Alley has asked the Registrar and AVC for Enrollment Management Kevin Browne to do some good modeling. Initial data from last year showed that we used the classrooms at about 46 – 47% utilization. The lab data showed that labs are at 100% utilization, but that must be untrue. There are chunks of time when the labs are not being utilized. The data also showed that the small classrooms are the most impacted right now. The 100 + seats classrooms will become the most impacted in the future as the upper division classes start to grow in size.
- Our campus may consider the possibility of installing a Butler Building that would be divided into four classrooms and can seat 400-450 students. We will probably have to take out another loan for that.

General Education

- CAPRA drafted a memo that stated that the administration should provide faculty with specific information about resources available for the delivery of General Education.
- EVC Alley stated that it will be difficult to provide faculty with a specific dollar amount. However, he could address specific questions related to resources such as how much money will be available for x number of lecturers or faculty. We are trying to come up with an algorithm for the instructional budgets of the Schools and the algorithm is driven by enrollment numbers. As enrollment grows, more money would be put into instructional budget. Plus, there are the dollars from the unfilled faculty lines.

- A committee member inquired if EVC Alley still wants to see a proposal first. Alley answered that he would like to see general parameters, not necessarily a fully fleshed out proposal.
- There was some discussion about UC Merced having a college system. The cost might be prohibitive. The college system has its benefits, but it needs to be determined if we can afford those benefits.
- CAPRA briefly discussed the issue of the cost effectiveness of CORE 100. There is an argument that CORE 100 is less expensive then delivering general education through the majors. The counter argument is that delivering it through the majors fills in the gaps of the small majors. More analysis and resources are needed for this.
- EVC Alley noted that there was no support for the idea of stocking CORE 100 with lecturers. There should be some input from ladder-ranked faculty.
- A committee member mentioned that we also need to address CORE 1. There will be a large number of students taking CORE 1 in the spring.
- A committee member suggested allocating faculty to majors that agree to contribute to general education. For example, philosophy and the earth systems faculty would be good for general education courses. This suggestion can be added to CAPRA's memo.

Action: CAPRA's memo on CORE 100 will be re-circulated within the committee for comments. Final memo will be forwarded to the Division Council.

Capital Planning

- CAPRA was asked by the Division Council to comment on the State-Funded Capital Improvement Program. CAPRA has drafted initial comments.
- EVC Alley stated that there needs to be a much better development effort so we can start to get Phase II of this campus under construction.
- A committee member said that there's no clear relation between the capital budget and student numbers and no formula for determining our capital budget.
- EVC Alley pointed out that the campuses that are receiving a large amount of systemwide support are the ones that already have plenty of resources. The system has tried to make it more transparent as to how dollars are being allocated.

Classroom Space

- There was some discussion about CPEC numbers. A committee member claimed he would be more comfortable with requesting funds for medical school buildings if we knew the rest of the campus was relatively close to a good CPEC target.
- Another committee member pointed out that the Science & Engineering II building will be filled the day it opens. The School of Management building will

probably be full. We don't have any place to expand except for the interdisciplinary building.

- EVC Alley said that Phase I infrastructure was about $100 million. Phase II will probably be more than that. Infrastructural costs is the biggest issue. We have done everything we know possible to get Science & Engineering II to a bigger size. We are $20 million ahead of where we were. We asked for another $10 million in loans to get the building back to size but were denied. We are still trying to get the $15 million for Castle. It will probably be in the capital budget. The problem is that we might not get it in the timeframe that we need. VC for Administration Miller has come up with $75,000 to start the planning piece.

Action: Chair Heit announced that the Capital Planning memo will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2008.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul & Simrin Takhar

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE – Merced Division**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, November 3, 2008, 2:15 – 3:45PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 11/03/2008

AGENDA

Action	Item
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Evan Heit**
Action	**II. Consent Calendar** ▪ Draft Minutes, October 20 2008
Discussion	**III. Executive Session**
Discussion	**IV. Discussion Items:** **A.** School of Management Proposal (*Professors Conklin and Leppert are lead reviewers*) *Comments due by November 21, 2008* **B.** Capital Planning *Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the State-Funded Capital Improvement Program – [Preliminary comments available on crops: CAPRA 2008-09/Meeting Agendas&Handouts/MTG11-03-08/**CAPRA Comments on State-Funded CIP** folder]-Additional material available at: CAPRA 2008-09/**Capital Planning** folder* **C.** Long Range Development Plan *Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the LRDP- This item will be placed on the Dec.2 Division Council agenda* *Available on crops in the **LRDP** folder* **D.** Space *UCOP Space tables and CPEC adequacy report (from John White)* *Available on crops in the **Space** folder* **E.** IPA Data to the Deans (re schools strategic plans)
Discussion	**V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00)** ▪ Budget ▪ Space, and Campus Space Committee

- Faculty lines for 08-09
- Senate-Administration Council

Discussion **VI. Members' Items**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, November 3, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:15 p.m. on November 3, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Executive Session

This section will be distributed separately.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the October 20th Meeting we approved.

IV. State Funded Capital Improvement Program

The Division Council asked CAPRA to comment on the State-Funded Capital Improvement Program. CAPRA has drafted initial comments which were circulated within the committee prior to today's meeting.
Handouts (from the UCM office of Capital Planning): 1)Merced State CIP 10.03.08 UCOP Submittal; 2) Proposed Campus FTE Enrollments 2006-07 to 2020-21 and 3) UC Space Analysis Tables

Review/Discussion of the Merced State CIP 10.03.08 UCOP Submittal and the Proposed Campus FTE Enrollments 2006-07 to 2020-21 Documents

- CAPRA supports the idea of the Senate involvement in the CIP process every year.
- CAPRA is concerned about the lack of space in general and the availability of research and teaching space over the next few years.
- There is no clear connection between data presented in the CIP documents and information contained in the schools strategic plans.
- There is a discrepancy between space projections and actual space availability. For example: the opening of the SE 2 building is planned for 2013 and every square foot of the building has already been assigned. According to the proposal for a School of Medicine, UCM will be accepting medical students in 2013; however the CIP table shows that the Health Sciences building is planned for 2016.
- Anticipated enrollment numbers in Health Sciences are 144 students in 2015-16 and 224 in 2016-17. What kind of space will be available for them? How are the amount of teaching space, research space, office space and the idea of a Medical School opening at the same time going to unfold?

- In terms of strategic planning, is the plan for a Health Sciences building in 2016 realistic? Given the current space crisis, will the university be able to accommodate a Medical School in 2016?
- With the planned School of Management, SSHA which will also be filled to capacity; there will be no space to accommodate additional students and faculty.

Review/Discussion of the UC Space Analysis Tables (table of adequacy of assignable areas – total by campus and total university-wide

The chart lists actual space, allowed space and percentages of allowed space using CPEC standards.

- It is not clear if this table includes external funding or if these are strictly state-funded projects.
- CAPRA would like to know what set of assumptions were used in calculating the numbers and how realistic the numbers are.
- A census was taken in 2007 and data showed then that UCM's space utilization was poor due to low student enrollment.
- UCM is constrained in terms of what it is allowed to say to UCOP because UCOP's methodology is used to make the calculations. Any changes requested by UCM will need to be justified.
- It is assumed that the CPEC standards used to generate those figures include the renovation and use of the Castle satellite campus. Utilization of lab space at Castle has been an ongoing problem partly because of the isolation factor.

Action: CAPRA's memo on the CIP documents will be circulated within the committee for additional comments. Final draft will be sent to the Division Council on Wednesday, November 5th. CAPRA will invite John White (Director of Capital Planning) to attend its December 8th to discuss how space projections and initial assumptions for CIP are made.

V. <u>Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley</u>

The EVC/Provost reported on the following:

- Campus Space Committee: The EVC has received the campus space committee membership from the senate; however he would like its composition to be reconfigured. This will be communicated to the senate office.
- The EVC supports CAPRA's idea of inviting Director White to a future meeting to discuss capital planning.
- UCM's share of system wide post-budget cuts was $290,000; but these were averted.
- It is expected that there will be another $65M cut this year to the UC system.
- Governor Schwarzenegger has recommended a sales tax increase (1.8%).
- Possibility of an economic stimulus for capital projects for any projects that are already in the books for 2008-09 and 2009-10 (this would include the planned renovation projects for Castle).

- The best case scenario is that we keep the $6.3M we will be given this year for enrollment growth, we don't get any enrollment growth funds next year, and enroll up to 3450 students. We will also lose $5 million in supplemental state appropriation next year. It is not clear how these figures will translate in terms of faculty lines. It is estimated that four to five faculty lines will be allocated to each school next year.

Q and A:
Q – Will the space available at Castle be assigned strategically? What criteria will be used to assign that space?
A – The EVC is trying to put functional groups in Castle. There is some space available for four to five people in the former SNRI space. Faculty who will occupy that space will be affiliated with environmental disciplines. Additional space adjacent to building 1201 is also available and can accomodate up to five people.

Q – Given the cost of laboratory space and the likelihood of getting buildings in a timely fashion from the Office of the President, shouldn't UCM be targeting growth in SSHA?
A – We all believe that as the year goes on there will be an increasing shift towards the Social Sciences. Growth can be encouraged in certain disciplines by strengthening existing areas.

VI. <u>School of Management Proposal (SOM)</u>
Professors Conklin and Leppert were charged with submitting initial comments on the SOM proposal. (Hard copy of initial comments was distributed during the meeting).
[UGC and GRC were also charged with submitting their comments to the Division Council].

Initial Comments:
- The Vice Provost for Academic Planning performed extra costs scenarios which are not included in the proposal.
- The EVC indicated that he asked the Vice Provost for Academic Planning to focus the first five years of the proposal on undergraduate education, building research presence, building the faculty and identifying a couple of specialty areas that could lead to graduate programs (e.g. management of natural resources, entrepreneurship).
- Focusing more on undergraduate enrollment would provide more funding for the proposed School of Management.
- The School of Management could be proposed as a division of an existing school (vs. a stand-alone school) – this would not require UCOP approval and would not require hiring a Dean and would ultimately benefit the campus in terms of resources.
- MBAs and Executive MBAs are expensive majors.
- The plan is a visionary plan.

- Since the SOM is mostly enrollment-driven, what happens to the FTEs if student enrollments are lower than expected?
- Gifts are unreliable (the first five years of the School involve a $5M gifts and endowments as part of the revenue).
- What are the fundraising priorities?
- The School of Management is, to some extent, going to rely on existing faculty lines. How will that translate in terms of faculty workload?
- The management faculty needs to be hired by an existing Bylaw 55 unit. Who will be in charge of the hiring process?
- Element of program academic excellence missing from the proposal.
- The proposal states that there are demands for the program but does not present justifications.
- The proposal seems to assume a lot of M.S. Students.
- It is not clear if students will work as teaching assistants.
- SSHA currently has 30 graduate students (in its fourth year). The plan assumes that it will have 30 the first year of the school and 80 the second year. Are these numbers realistic?
- Leverage with other existing programs – What is the correlation between leverage in engineering and student enrollment? Some of the most innovative disciplines will not necessarily be the most popular among students.

Action: Professors Conklin and Leppert's draft comments will be circulated within CAPRA for input. Final memo will be forwarded to the Division Council by November 21, 2008.

VII. Long Range Development Plan

The Division Council asked CAPRA to opine on the LRDP. Professor Kelley volunteered to review the documents. His analysis will be discussed at the December 8th meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 17th.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE – Merced Division**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, November 17, 2008, 2:15 – 3:45PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 11/17/2008

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Evan Heit** ▪ November 4, 2008 UCPB Meeting	
Action	**II. Consent Calendar** ▪ Draft Minutes, November 3, 2008	
Discussion	**III. Discussion Items:** **A.** School of Management Proposal *Lead Reviewers: Professors Conklin and Leppert* *Comments due by November 21, 2008* **B.** Long Range Development Plan *Professor David Kelley* *Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the LRDP- This item will be placed on the Dec.2 Division Council agenda* *Available on crops in the **LRDP** folder* **C.** IPA Data to the Deans (re schools strategic plans) **D.** 2009-2010 Faculty Allocations (please see EVC's memo on crops)	
Discussion	**IV. System-wide Review Items** **A.** UC Accountability Framework Draft Report http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/documents/accountabilityframework_draft.pdf *Senate Chair will report on this item at the November 24 Academic Council Meeting* **B.** Education Abroad Business Plan http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/EAP%20Business%20Plan%20Memo.pdf This item will be placed on the December 1st Division Council Meeting	
Discussion	**V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00)** ▪ Budget ▪ 2009-2010 Faculty Allocations (please see EVC's memo on crops)	

- Space

Discussion **VI. Members' Items**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, November 17, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:15 p.m. on November 17, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Items discussed at the UCPB November 4th meeting included the following:

- UCM School of Medicine.
- There are currently eleven proposals for new schools across the UC system undergoing review. UCPB suggested that criteria for review of new schools be drafted and distributed to the UCs.
- UCFW memo to Academic Council stating that this year is not a suitable year to propose new schools.
- Proposal to reconstitute UCR Graduate School of Management – Discussion about combining an MBA and an undergraduate business program. A few years ago, UCR wanted to shift the undergraduate management program to the business school. The campus faced many obstacles during the process mainly because of the lack of permanent faculty to administer the program. This is something to keep in mind during the review of the proposal for a UCM School of Management.
- UC Budget - Executive Vice President for Business Operations Katie Lapp reviewed her 9/22/08 presentation to the Regents which summarized long-term forecasting of the system wide budget, budget scenarios and financial challenges facing the university. The purpose of the presentation was to make the Regents aware of the financial challenges that lie ahead. Chair Heit reminded members that he is open to discussion about the presentation.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the November 3rd Meeting we approved.

IV. Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) Report to CAPRA

During the CAPRA review of the strategic plans, the schools are asked to submit enrollment data about their majors and number of FTEs under each discipline. Last year CAPRA raised the point that data across the schools were inconsistent. The EVC proposed that this year's accounting be performed by an independent third party. Therefore, the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis will provide data directly to CAPRA, thus ensuring uniformity across the three schools and eliminating the need for each school to create its own data tables. Data will include the number of majors in the

program affiliated with a prefix, the number of student credit hours taught in courses offered by the program and the number of student credit hours taught by instructors assigned to the program. CAPRA welcomed this procedure as it could be an opportunity to establish principles on workload following faculty.

CAPRA reviewed a chart provided by the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis listing UCM faculty, their discipline and home department. The chart is available on crops. CAPRA comments on the document included the following:

- Split appointments - There are faculty with split appointments who probably don't have a single undergraduate prefix and who probably wouldn't want all their workload to be attributed to one school vs. another.
- General Education courses are not properly attributed to the faculty teaching the course(s). For example, Professor Martin-Rodriguez has taught some core courses but this is not represented on the chart.
- Graduate courses - Should graduate teaching be accumulated separately? In Physical Sciences, a graduate student would typically take a year of courses (four courses). The bulk of his/her education would consist of research, seminars, individual study etc. Not counting graduate courses would undermine the effort involved with having graduate students. There are a couple of different perspectives: the faculty perspective and the accounting perspective. From the faculty member's point of view, the teaching load is the most compelling factor but from an accounting point of view there are all the research credit hours and the regular lecture teaching.
- If a faculty member teaches research credits and has two students who are both signed up for 8 to 12 credits, it does not mean that the instructor is doing three times as much work as an instructor who teaches CHEM 2 with 120 students.
- In terms of CAPRA's business, the committee may consider data about the number of graduate students in each graduate group. [Professor Conklin has some data on grants for each graduate group which will be circulated the next semester when CAPRA is looking at the graduate groups plans].
- Although most of the teaching loads are attributed to the undergraduate programs, it would be helpful to represent the graduate category because at some point graduate groups will be well defined at UCM.

CAPRA's view is that faculty with split-school appointments should be given the choice to designate two prefixes. The committee also agreed to accumulate graduate teaching separately, using the same scale and not including research units.

V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley

Chair Heit updated EVC/Provost Alley on CAPRA's discussion on the accounting of faculty workload. The EVC/Provost noted that he welcomes the idea of tallying graduate and undergraduate courses separately and giving faculty members with split appointments the choice to designate two prefixes.

The EVC/Provost reported on the following:
To address budget cuts, The Office of the President asked UC campuses to curtail their expenditures. Prior to today's meeting, the EVC had sent a memo to the Senate in which he asked the Deans to reduce their 2009-2010 FTEs searches to no more than two or three most critical positions per school.

He also reported that the University is facing grave financial problems. UCM will lose $5M from the state next year. The enrollment target for next year is 3400 (including graduate students). Even with an additional 700 students enrolled; the campus's revenue will be very low. The only revenues associated with the additional 700 students are registration fees and educational fees. Without the 700 additional students, UCM would be in a worse position. The campus would lose the $5M (from the state), it would not collect any revenue and it would have to disburse mandatory costs (e.g. health benefits, salaries, utility costs). So in fact, with 700 additional students enrolled, there is some new revenue, although minimal. If UCM doesn't enroll any students this year, the campsu will lose momentum which will affect students' progress towards graduation.

The campus's total budget is about $30M. The administration finds it very difficult to do any kind of adequate planning given the lack of data. The EVC/Provost is hoping that UCM will keep the $6.3M that it will receive from the other campuses this year but there will be no additional funds for the next increment of students.

If we assume that there will be a 10% increase in tuition fees (about $7000 per student) and if we enroll 700 students we will have $4.9 M revenue ($5.9 with marginal costs). One third of those dollars has to go to financial aid. This will take us down to $3.6M which is below the $5M that we are supposed to backfill with enrollment funds. Then of course, there are additional costs such as health benefits and retirement contributions. If we don't get marginal costs next year, we will basically have $10M of unfilled costs.

There will be another budget cut next year ($50 to 100M) further reducing campuses budgets and flexibility with resources.

UCM is borrowing $5M/year (for eight years) from the other campuses and will have to repay $40M in loans. Looking at the amount of revenue ($84M) that UCM has this year vs. potential commitments ($92M); one can see that there is about $8M deficit. Every year UCM has been able to balance the budget because of its conservative approach. Some faculty have not spent their start-up packages as fast as they might have in different circumstances and units have delayed staff hiring. UCM should save about $370,000 by reducing its supplies and expenses by half.

Student success revolves around faculty and the ability to deliver majors. The university has to balance limited funds, student success and the ability of doing research.

Comments from the committee:

- In the past we have explored ways that would increase enrollment but since this may not pay off this year, what should UCM try to optimize? Up until now we were told to increase enrollment and focus on activities that increase enrollment, such as the shared experience program. Now it seems that the rules have changed. Furthermore, the Office of the President stated that it "understands that UCM needs to grow" but there is no clear statement about the provenance of the funds that would support the campus growth. The UCM senate would like some clarification.
- UCM may not be getting a share of the $65M in cuts but it is not getting anything that looks like an increase either.
- This completely changes the nature of the equation that CAPRA has to deal with: if enrollment support is going to be held back, it will change the way CAPRA views and analyzes strategic plans.
- 2700 students is a very low number of students to allow the university to be sustainable and it will have considerable implications on faculty recruitment.
- There are some faculty lines that are essential to enable the university to properly deliver quality education. However, in the past CAPRA has seen requests for faculty lines for which UCM would get very few students. Those requests were subsequently not recommended by CAPRA. Perhaps CAPRA could take a different approach this year and should not reject such requests, based on research needs and strategic academic planning.

The EVC/Provost noted that UCM is not equipped with good parameters that would allow the campus to perform adequate planning. At this time, the only way UCOP can help UCM is by taking more money from the other campuses. In terms of strategic planning, he noted that CAPRA could consider the following when reviewing the schools strategic plans:

1) Are there any opportunity hires?
2) Where are the biggest problems in terms of majors?

Chair Heit reported that there are two faculty groups developing new majors in SSHA (Arts and Sociology) and asked the EVC if there are any indicators he could give to the Dean of SSHA and to faculty as to what resources might be available for new majors. The EVC responded that there are no new resources available for new majors next year but that he would have to see the proposals first before making any recommendation.

VI. <u>School of Management Proposal (SOM)</u>

Lead Reviewers: Professors Conklin and Leppert

Professors Conklin and Leppert had submitted comments on the SOM proposal prior to today's meeting.

Chair Heit noted that the administration could consider unlocking some of the endowments to initiate some intermediate hiring. This would allow UCM to perform some interim planning especially with the forthcoming system-wide hiring freeze. The Vice Provost for Academic Planning is considering some intermediate steps such as opening the Center for Entrepreneurship. It is anticipated that this center would not require additional resources.

CAPRA's main concerns about the SOM proposal are briefly described below:

- **Resources**. The proposed funding model for the SOM is 85% state-funded. This is a very optimistic scenario. CAPRA recommended consideration a different scenario.
- **Gifts**. A $5M gift and endowment portion is mentioned as part of the school's operating revenue. $5M is a very low sum to launch a school.
- **Resources of teaching**. The proposal states that the SOM will offer some cross-schools courses. It is not clear to CAPRA which faculty will teach those courses. The existing faculty is already stretched.
- **Space**. The SSM building may be filled to capacity within year of opening. How will faculty, students and staff be accommodated? Current space is already extremely limited.
- **Library costs** are relatively high and should be included in the fixed costs.
- Senate Chair Conklin noted that at UCLA Anderson School of Management, a fifth of the total budget of the school is state revenues (opposite to this proposal). UCLA's Executive MBA programs and the Fully-Employed MBA are intensive courses that are offered in the evening and/or during week-ends. Is there a real demand for the EMBAs in the San Joaquin Valley?
- Proposed SOM salaries are very high ($150000). At UCSF, salaries are $200000. Does Merced have the economic foundation for this level of compensation?
- Table 3 (page 29) needs to be revised: UCSB and UCLA do not offer a business major.

This proposal is extremely diffuse. If UCM is going to open the SOM and hire a dean, the proposal needs to be more focused. CAPRA would like to see more examples of how everything is going to unfold. CAPRA is not opposed to opening a new school. The committee is only raising issues in hopes of strengthening the proposal. The committee suggests that these concerns be addressed before the proposal goes forward to the next level of approval.

Chair Heit welcomed more input on the proposal and suggested that members submit comments by the end of the week. In the absence of additional comments, the current draft of CAPRA's memo on the SOM will be considered final and will be forwarded to the Division Council.

VII. Long Range Development Plan

http://lrdp.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lvl2=40&contentid=40

The Division Council asked CAPRA to opine on the LRDP. Professor Kelley's analysis will be discussed at the December 8th meeting.

VIII. System-wide Review Item: Accountability Report

Senate Chair Conklin solicited members' comments on the Accountability Report.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 8th.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE – Merced Division**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, December 8, 2008, 2:15 – 3:45PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 12/08/2008

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Professor Evan Heit**	
Action	**II. Consent Calendar**	
	▪ Draft Minutes, November 17, 2008	1-6
Discussion	**III. Administrative Guests:**	
	John White, Director Capital Planning & Mary Miller, VC Administration	
	(Scheduled for 2:30-3:00pm)	
	Discussion: Space Projections, CPEC standards and assumptions used to calculate CIP numbers	
	Please refer to crops: CAPRA 2008-2009/Resources/ Meetings-Agendas&Handouts/ MTG 12/08/2008/**Capital Planning** folder	
	1. UCM CPEC Analysis	10
	2. CPEC Utilization Standards	11-20
	3. Space Utilization Tables Fall 2007	21-32
	4. CPEC Definition of Standard Space & Space Planning Guidelines	33-43
	5. CPEC Updated Categories Fall 2008	44
Discussion	**IV. Discussion Items:**	
	A. Senate-Administrative Committee	
	Senate Chair Conklin asked senate committees to compile a list of issues to be addressed by this committee.	45-46
	B. IPA Report to CAPRA	
	Preliminary data on faculty workload posted on crops:	
	CAPRA 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings-Agendas&Handouts/MTG 12/08/08 /**IPA Data** folder	
	List of faculty with prefixes has been requested and will be distributed upon receipt.	
	1. Nov 24th IPA report on faculty workload	49-50
	2. Senate Members and discipline (as of Fall 08)	54-57
	3. Non-Senate Members & Senate Members with Administrative Position and department	58-59
	4. Student credit hours taught by faculty (senate members) Fall 08	60-69
	5. Fall 08 senate and non-senate members instructors listed by dept	70-80

C. Long Range Development Plan 81

Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the LRDP

Professor David Kelley's comments are posted on crops:

CAPRA 2008-2009/Resources/ Meetings-Agendas&Handouts/ MTG 12/08/2008/**LRDP** folder

Discussion **V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00)**

- 2009-2010 Operating Budget

Discussion **VI. Members' Items**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, December 8, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:15 p.m. on December 8, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Chair's Report

- The January 5th meeting may be cancelled, depending on budget updates from the EVC/Provost.
- Next semester's CAPRA meetings will be held from 2:00 until 3:30pm.
- Chancellor Kang recently announced a staff hiring freeze at UC Merced. CAPRA will address this issue today with the EVC/Provost.
- CAPRA's role in the evaluation of the schools strategic plans: The process may be affected due to the reduction of faculty lines next year. It is expected that all but 15 of the 36 positions previously authorized will be pulled back.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the November 17th Meeting we approved.

IV. Administrative Guests: John White, Director Capital Planning and Mary Miller, VC Administration

CAPRA invited John White, Director of Capital Planning to discuss the capital planning process and how it relates to academic planning. CAPRA is also curious about the funding mechanism for SE 2.

VC Administration Miller was also present and reported that the SE 2 project will most likely be secured in next year's lease revenue bond. If approved, construction is to begin prior to July 1, 2010. SE 2 should be ready for occupancy by January 2013.

Director White gave CAPRA a general overview of the operations of the Capital Planning Office:
UCM's site development and Infrastructure Phase 4 Project is included in the President-Elect stimulus package. This project totals about $5M. The office of Capital Planning is engaged in a feasibility study of the project. Design work is planned for January 2009.

Capital planning is closely connected to academic planning, physical planning and space planning. All the UCs are scheduled to give a formal presentation to the Regents about how all these forms of planning are connected. UCM is mainly focused on academic planning for instruction and research buildings. This form of planning presumably occurs through Academic Affairs, through the Schools and other appropriate channels (EVC, Chancellor). The strategic academic plan, schools strategic plans and will come forth and will help shape a reconciled plan across Academic Affairs. In order for a plan to help inform academic, space or capital planning,

it needs to take into account whether the campus' approved Long Range Enrollment Plan is tailored to be consistent with information in the plans. The information contained in the strategic academic plan is critical for both physical planning and capital planning.

The Office of Capital Planning - in consultation with the Associate VC Physical Planning Design & Construction - considers different factors such as what parts of the campus will be developed, how much will be developed and the density of the campus. All of this information eventually becomes public data through the Long Range Development Plan. The Office of Capital Planning also works closely with the EVC/Provost, the School Deans and the Campus Physical Planning Committee. This path of communications is somewhat similar across the UC system.

Capital projects need to be academically justified and need to take into account the priorities of the campus. Those projects are put together on an annual basis in the framework of the five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of state and non-state funded projects. Non-state funded projects are usually self-supporting projects (housing, dining, parking, recreation). The CIP is presented to the Regents for information purposes only and provides an overview of what is currently expected to be the campus' capital program over the next five years.

In terms of Academic Planning, the State and CPEC have many requirements. The process used to submit information for state support is very structured and directly ties to the approved long Range workload. Faculty and students workload drives a lot of planning for space allowances and it shows how needy we are.

Q & A from the Committee

Q – Could the renovation of the Castle campus be part of the Phase 4 Project development?

A – UCOP stated that Castle will not be included but development of the Castle campus is still in UCM's five-year Capital Improvement Program. The Office of Capital Planning has proposed to do design work between now and July 2010; however the Castle project does not have the same certainty of funding as SE 2 because it is not included in the lease revenue bond projects. An updated Capital Improvement Plan will be submitted to UCOP in the spring-summer timeframe. UCM still has another year in the five-year window. New projects could be introduced during that year. Throughout the year the Physical Planning Committee tries to identify priorities for future funding requests. The status of all UC capital projects will be reviewed when the governor's budget is issued in January, 2009. This will be an opportunity for UCM to review all the projects across the UC system and evaluate funding opportunities.

Q- Could you tell us how you populate the numbers in the CPEC analysis used for SE2 (page 10 of handout)?

A – Different individuals are responsible for different elements in this document. The data mainly comes from Academic Affairs (including IPA, EVC/Provost, Deans and Student Affairs). IPA is the office responsible for maintaining most of the data for the campus.

Q- Does this document include the actual number of faculty, graduate students and disciplines?

A – Yes. Actual data is reported through IPA. Data can also be verified through the personnel system, as required by UCOP.

Q- Is this a projection through year 2014?

A- Yes, it is an example and it was used for justification of SE 2. This report is based on a larger level of need which is the total amount of built instruction and research space compared to the total allowance. At the time this analysis was done (5/31/07), the campus' CPEC adequacy without SE 2 was 59% (69%, with CPEC adequacy). The reason the year 2014-15 is used is because when we go forward with state funded projects the State will allow us to size the building at two years post occupancy. This allows us to develop a little bit of extra capacity into the building. The same principle is used across the UC s and the state of CA.

Space is generated based on the needs and nature of the different programs. For example, some of the engineering and biology disciplines will get more space than the office space disciplines. At the time this data was developed there wasn't a Strategic Academic Plan so the office of Capital Planning used the approved workload tables from the perspective of OP. These categories will eventually get replaced by more program-specific information and data will be substituted as the university moves forward and once a detailed SAP comes forth.

Q – Is more base funding per square foot allocated to Engineering?

A- No, there is no differential whether it is engineering, biology or philosophy. The campus gets Operations and Maintenance of Plant funding. OMP is currently funded at $9.50 per square foot. Those funds cover a wide variety of expenditures (e.g. utilities, gardening, maintenance of grounds, minor repairs) and are received on an annual basis. Auxiliary enterprises (housing, parking, student centers) are self-supporting programs and do not received OMP funding.

Equipment budgeting is performed differently. For large capital planning projects, there is a certain amount of funds allocated called overload equipment which includes furniture and scientific equipment. Each program within the Science and Engineering building helps generate an allowance. Funding for overload equipment is capped according to a formula. At UCM, the majority of funds are spent on buildings vs. furnishing and/or equipment.

Q – How does the space at Castle affect Capital Planning?

A – Castle is a resource for UCM but it is also an impediment. When UCM leased the Castle property, it agreed to a long-term lease (until 2025) in order to be granted OMP support. The policy is that no OMP funding is allocated to any UCs for leased space *on* campus. In the early stages of UCM's development, Castle was the campus' only research facility. The office of Capital Planning made the case to OP that the campus could not operate without financial support so an exception was requested and approved by the State for the duration of the lease. We made a commitment to use that space. The State also invested about $5M for capital projects aimed at improving a portion of the labs at the Castle facility. The utilization of the space at Castle influences the main campus less and less overtime.

Instructional Space

See "Table U-2C: Classroom Utilization by Room Size fall 2007", page 21 of the handout.

This data comes from the office of the Registrar and is currently being updated for fall 2008. UCM will presumably witness a greater utilization of space in fall 2008. The table shows percentages of standards for total utilization of space by classroom size. It is a combination of variables, such as teaching load and number of seats filled from 7am until 7pm, Monday

through Friday. UCM has to be at 100% to meet the State's minimum standards. This table shows that across the campus, the total utilization of classroom space was at 57.7 % of CPEC requirements (minimum standards are 100%). In the previous analysis (fall 2006), the figure was down to 39% which is why it was difficult for UCM to make a compelling case then.

Q – In terms of instructional space, does information on this table have more weight than the data in the previously discussed spreadsheet (page 10)?
A – UCOP considers our output -- the productivity of our space -- by analyzing weekly student contact hours (WSCH). The number of WSCH for lab space and for "regular" instructional space is audited and reported to UCOP. Initially, UCM could not generate that data so data from UCSC was used to help make the projections.

This data comes from the office of the Registrar. All three semesters are reported. The summer semester is the most challenging due to low space utilization so it drives data down for the whole year. When analyzing the numbers on this table we need to consider what the match (or mismatch) is between the way teaching is performed in regards to space availability. The teaching laboratory utilization by room size (table U-2T) shows the most amount of progress in a single year (99.6%. The number was below 50% in fall 2006).

This data is invaluable to the campus because it is the justification for our capital projects requests.

V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley

EVC/Provost Alley reported on the following items:

UCOP Officials Visit to UCM

Upcoming visit on December 17th and 18th of Robert D. Grey (Interim Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs), Daniel Greenstein (Vice Provost, Academic Information and Strategic Services/UC Librarian, and Executive Director, California Digital Library), Debora Obley (Associate VP for Budget Operations) and Mary Croughan (System-wide Senate Chair). These individuals will meet with the UCM Division Council on December 18, 2008.

Budget

UCM's budget model is built on the notion that in the next three years the campus will lose state support and the expectation is that this gap will be backfilled with marginal costs dollars. This year, UCM received $6.3M which backfilled the $4M loss in state support. The next two years, the campus will lose $5M each year which will need to be backfilled with enrollment support as specified in the Higher Education Compact (the agreement provides for annual growth in state funding for UC's basic budget and enrollment growth).

The Office of the President is warning the UCs against over enrollment. In fact, 11000 students are currently unfunded across the UC system. It is expected that there will be a large referral pool (12000 to 15000 students). At this moment there is no indication that the State will step up and provide funding for enrollment. All the UC campuses are planning for additional cuts in their budgets.

Q&A:

Q – The campus' funding model is and has been based on enrollment growth so what model should be adopted now that the parameters are different? How will these budget cuts affect faculty incentives to grow student enrollment?

A – It is difficult to answer these questions without having clarity on the budget and without knowing the amount of funds that the State will provide. We will not be able to move forward unless this information is available. The campus budget currently has provisions for 36 faculty lines but funds are allocated to 15 of those lines (funds include salaries and start-up packages). If we actually hired those 36 faculty this year, we would be in the red unless we receive some backfill for the $5M that we are going to lose.

Q – Are those 15 funded faculty lines associated with the assumption of enrollment support for 2000 or 2600 students?

A – The campus is getting enrollment support for 1800 students. The $6.3M are not considered enrollment support because they are not state funds. The 15 positions are predicated on getting the $6.3M. The assumptions are the following: a) we keep the $6.3M; b) we do not get any marginal cost dollars for next year's enrollment growth; c) tuition will be raised by 10% and d) we have to pay 4% for retirement contributions. Even if the campus does not keep the $6.3M, there will be less than 15 fundable positions or no positions at all.

Q - So if the campus gets the marginal costs ($10,000 per students) and not the $6.3M, would the campus still be sustainable?

A – Here is the situation: The 36 faculty lines include unsuccessful searches (positions that have been vacant for up to four years and have not yet been filled) and the 12 new allocations made last year. If we get to keep the $6.3M; the budgetary situation will still remain a problem. We do have funds in the budget for next year provisions for 15 faculty lines (including salaries and start-up packages). If we lose the $6.3M we will not be able to hire any faculty.

Q – You said that suppositions were made for 15 faculty lines, based on getting the $6.3M and with no new marginal costs dollars. If the campus received the marginal costs of instruction for the new increment of students and not the $6.3M, the situation would remain unchanged. So is it better to get the $6.3M or the marginal costs of instruction?

A - This year the campus has $10M in state support which will be reduced to $5M in July 2009 so UCM will need new marginal cost dollars or some other form of revenue to offset that reduction. The campus was able to keep the $6.3M this year because there were no marginal costs dollars associated with those funds. Being able to keep the marginal costs dollars would generate funds for the campus in the range of $7M.

CAPRA expressed its concern about the following:

- Offers and searches being pulled back because of the budget crisis
- The impact on negotiation of salaries and consequences on the hiring process in general
- The ability of making post dates offers
- The impact the hiring freeze will have on the campus' ability to hire lecturers next year
- The impact on the schools strategic plans given the likelihood of impending limitations on faculty lines

The EVC responded that the current financial crisis will affect salaries, especially start-up packages for junior faculty. He also noted that he will meet with the Deans of the three Schools on December 11th to discuss all of these issues.

In response to a committee member's question regarding indirect costs and whether those funds can be used for graduate students support, the EVC/Provost stated that he will review data related to the campus opportunity funds, costs projections and funds needed to pay off the $10M in loans. He will report back to CAPRA at a future meeting.

Institutes

The Biomedical Institute is moving forward but there are no formal policies and procedures for approving institutes at UCM. A previous GRC had drafted some policies to establish ORUs but those were never formally reviewed nor approved by the Senate.

VI. <u>IPA Report to CAPRA</u>

CAPRA will review the report to identify any discrepancies. Committee members will notify CAPRA Chair and senate analyst by the end of the week.

VII. <u>LRDP Comments</u>

Professor Kelley's draft comments were previously distributed to CAPRA and will be circulated within the committee for input. Final draft will be forwarded to the Division Council.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 5th.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE – Merced Division**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, January 26, 2009, 2:00 – 3:30PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 01/26/2009

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. Chair's Report – Professor Evan Heit** *UCPB – Jan 6, 2009 Meeting*	
Action	**II. Consent Calendar** ▪ Draft Minutes, December 8, 2008	
Discussion	**III. Guest:** **Gregg Camfield, Chair of the WASC Steering Committee** **VC Administration** **(Scheduled for 2:15-2:30pm)** *Discussion: WASC Accreditation*	
Discussion	**IV. Discussion Items:**	
	A. President Yudof Proposal on UC Financial Aid	
	B. IPA Report to CAPRA *Preliminary data on faculty workload posted on crops:* CAPRA 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings-Agendas&Handouts/MTG 12/08/08 /**IPA Data** folder *List of faculty with prefixes has been requested and will be distributed upon receipt.*	
	1. Nov 24th IPA report on faculty workload	49-50
	2. Senate Members and discipline (as of Fall 08)	54-57
	3. Non-Senate Members & Senate Members with Administrative Position and department	58-59
	4. Student credit hours taught by faculty (senate members) Fall 08	60-69
	5. Fall 08 senate and non-senate members instructors listed by dept	70-80
	C. Long Range Development Plan	81
	Division Council asked that CAPRA comment on the LRDP *Professor David Kelley's comments are posted on crops:* CAPRA 2008-2009/Resources/ Meetings-Agendas&Handouts/ MTG 12/08/2008/**LRDP** folder	
Discussion	Request from SSHA	

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, January 26, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 2:00 p.m. on January 26, 2009, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Evan Heit presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Schedule of meetings
The February 9th will be a two-hour meeting (2:00-4:00pm). CAPRA has invited Gregg Camfield (Chair, WASC Steering Committee) to attend that meeting to discuss the upcoming WASC Review and SSHA Dean Hans Bjornsson to address the School of Management proposal.

December 9 and January 6 UCPB Meetings
UCPB reviewed a revised proposal for the UC Davis School of Nursing (proposed with $100 M start-up grants). UCPB recommended against approval of the School, deemed unsustainable and because of the lack of commitment from the State.

The Regents are considering a $2 billion capital bond issue intended to finance structural upgrades mainly at UCB and UCLA.

Visit of the UCM Administration and Senate Chair to UCOP on January 22nd.
Senate chair Conklin reported that the meeting was promising. President Yudof seemed to understand that UCM's current funding model is not sustainable. UCOP officials present at the meeting were supportive of the campus. Chair Conklin also noted that UCM's budget and space issues will be an uphill struggle and the administration needs to be fully aware that classroom and research space cannot be separated during the planning process.

III. Consent Calendar

Pending corrections or edits, Minutes for the December 8th Meeting were approved.

IV. CAPRA Plans for the Semester

Schools Strategic Plans
Over the last few years CAPRA has been successful in establishing processes and criteria for reviewing the Schools strategic plans and providing useful feedback to the Schools and to the EVC. Faced with the current hiring freeze, the Schools are not inclined to write their strategic plans. This will be discussed with the EVC/Provost.

Shared Governance

Chair Heit stressed the importance of shared governance and referred to the UCM Senate December 23rd memo to the EVC requesting that he consider ways to improve senate consultation. The memo also addressed issues surrounding instructional budget and requested that the administration provide faculty with clear, explicit criteria for cutting or freezing faculty lines. CAPRA will also consider ways to make sure that these goals are pursued this semester and in the future.

General Education (Core 1 and Core 100)

Last semester, CAPRA received a report from IPA listing UCM faculty, their discipline and home department. In a memo to IPA Director Ochsner, Chair Heit noted that faculty contributions to the delivery of general education seemed to be undercounted. The report took into account faculty who are primary instructors for core courses and dismissed the teaching workload of others. Therefore, Chair Heit requested an accurate accounting of hours of instruction related to general education. The flow of resources for delivery of general education is also a concern to the committee.

Items to be discussed with EVC/Provost Alley

- Rationale for allocating faculty lines and for freezing searches
- CAPRA's role during the review of the Schools strategic plans (or lack thereof), given the current freeze of searches
- CAPRA will encourage the EVC to send additional instructions and provide clarity to faculty and to the School Deans regarding the preparation of strategic plans and requests for faculty lines. CAPRA will also request that the EVC inform the Schools that the strategic plans will be used during the decision-making for freezing or releasing faculty lines.
- Instructional Budget – The EVC had previously mentioned that the current fiscal year's funding for lecturers would approximately be the same as last year's.

V. <u>Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley</u>

The EVC/Provost reported on the following:

- *Strategic Plans* – The EVC/Provost has received some strategic plans from some graduate groups. Those will be forwarded to CAPRA.
- *The January 22nd meeting* with President Yudof was a fairly positive meeting. It seemed that OP officials understood the issues facing UCM. He reported that they seemed worried about the campus' situation and realized how critical it is. During the meeting, President Yudof noted that he is not in favor of a reduced enrollment scenario at UCM. There was also some discussion about a possible ten year delay of payment of interest rates for UCM debts.
- *Instructional Budget* - The EVC has requested some data which will be shared with CAPRA when available. He noted that with an increment of 700 students, UCM will get the revenue from student fees minus the return-to-aid. If the Office of the President allows some debt delay or debt forgiveness, it will help the campus.
- *TAs and Lecturers* - There will be some additional allocations but the EVC is unsure about the exact number. TAs and lecturers share the same pool of money. There is a good pool (about 12 or 13% up from last year) and the internal resident pool is much higher than last year's which is good because there are very few slots available for the NRT dollars.

Questions/Comments from the Committee:
Q - Faculty is concerned about the impact of the current budget crisis on the classroom and research space, graduate education and on the ability to run successful searches.

A -The Administration is committed to backfilling the gap created by the lack of state supplemental funds. Once this happens, we will need to continue to increase the number of faculty. This year, we can't afford to hire 36 faculty but we can add at least 15 lines and I am hopeful that the same will be done next year. This year's 15 faculty lines would include unfreezing many of the positions that are currently placed on hold. $8.5M were allocated for faculty recruitment (five lines per school). Those funds were averaged with the number of faculty lines allocated for each school and with the amount of start-up funds available in each school. If OP give us the current $6.3M and an additional $6.3M with a promise that they would try to do the same in 2010-11, we would then be able to plan effectively around our growth. We need to remain conservative in regards to our budget.

CAPRA requested that the EVC/Provost write a memo to the Schools asking them to shift their requests for faculty lines and that those readjustments be made in full consultation with faculty.

According to the CAPRA timeline for reviewing the Schools strategic plans, the schools were supposed to submit their plans to the EVC by January 19, 2009 and submit their second drafts by March 16. To date, no plans were sent to the EVC or CAPRA. It was noted that CAPRA and the EVC are expecting the Schools to submit their plans.

Indirect Cost Return
Some faculty have requested that a portion of the indirect cost return (ICR) be returned to the program to facilitate research activities, given the lack of infrastructure.
Q- A portion of the ICR is allocated for capital development. What is the size of that pool? What is the estimate in either aggregate amount or per grant dollar that can be spent on campus for research activities?
A - ICR total about $1.5M which represents a certain percentage of what is returned to the campus. 20% goes to support sponsored programs activities. Then there are some funds that go into the general funds pool (19933 funds) which is differentiated for UCM from the state funds or 19900 funds. We actually used those two pools for grants and contracts [There is no return to the campus for grants that don't carry ICR]. 35% go to the opportunity funds. That money is built on a model that shows a linear progression during our first two years of growth. It is not a sustainable model. Furthermore, projections show a growing gap between funds needed for debt repayment and availability of funds (this year we accrued $16.8M in expenditures vs. $10.9M last year). This will not affect the development of SEII but we do have to find other sources of revenue. We have committed to the repayment of the $10M loan and we need to consider the differential between our current resources and resources needed to move forward.

Q – Could we initiate negotiations with OP and ask them to return all of the overhead which in fact, represents a very small percentage of the overall budget?
A – We can bring it to their attention.

VI. Review of the Proposal for a Graduate Group in Psychological Sciences

Lead Reviewer: Professor David F. Kelley

The Psychological Sciences proposal was sent to the EVC and GRC along with two letters of support (one from SSHA Dean Bjornsson and one from VCR/Dean of Graduate Studies Traina).

During its preliminary review of the proposal, CAPRA noticed several issues surrounding faculty lines, space and resources in general:

- The proposal states that the administration has committed two or three faculty lines per year to the program (a table in the proposal assumes three faculty lines per year).
- Does the proposal have the critical mass to deliver the curriculum at the undergraduate and graduate level?
- The proposal mentions plans for a dedicated building to psychology.
- Proposals for new majors are often accompanied with explicit resource requests. CAPRA would like to know if this proposal is also a request for resources.
- Will CAPRA's vetting of the proposal be construed as approval of resource requests?
- This proposal will eventually go to CCGA for review, and CAPRA would like parties on campus to be aware of how CCGA considers resource issues, especially during the current financial crisis.

Although two letters of support were provided to CAPRA, the committee recommends that, before moving forward to CCGA, explicit documentation regarding commitment resources is attached to the proposal. In general, CAPRA believes that faculty should know what their resources are so that they can write a realistic proposal. The committee shared its concerns with the EVC.

The EVC/Provost noted that the psychological sciences faculty had informed him earlier of a request for nine faculty lines but they were told to explore alternatives such as hiring LPSOEs, adjuncts. He added that he has not promised a specific number of faculty lines or a dedicated building for the program.

Action: CAPRA will forward its comments on the proposal to GRC by January 28th. GRC will include CAPRA's memo in its report to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

In addition, the EVC/Provost is to share a draft memo with the Psychological Sciences faculty regarding potential resources to be available.

VII. Review of the Washington Advisory Group (WAG) Final Report

Lead reviewer: Professor Mike Colvin

Action: Professor Colvin's draft comments will be circulated within the committee for input. This item will be discussed at the Feb. 9, 2009 CAPRA meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 9th.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Discussion **V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley (Scheduled for 3:00)**

- 2009-2010 Operating Budget
- Allocation of Lecturers and TAs
- School Strategic Plans

Discussion **VI. Members' Items**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE – Merced Division

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, February 9, 2009, 2:00 – 4:00PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 02/09/2009

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. CHAIR'S REPORT – PROFESSOR EVAN HEIT** *UCPB – Feb 3, 2009 Meeting*	
Action	**II. CONSENT CALENDAR** ▪ Draft Minutes, January 26, 2009	
Discussion	**III. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY** *Scheduled for 2:15pm* ▪ Instructional Budget ▪ Schools Strategic Plans ▪ 2009-2010 Operating Budget	
Discussion	**IV. SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL** *SSHA Dean Hans Bjornsson* *Scheduled for 2:35pm* ▪ Resource Implications of Proposal ▪ Management Faculty FTEs ▪ Other Management-Related Initiatives	
Discussion	**V. WASC REVIEW** *Professor Gregg Camfield, Chair, WASC Steering Committee* *Scheduled for 3:00pm-3:15pm*	
Discussion	**VI. REVIEW OF THE WAG FINAL REPORT** *Lead Reviewer: Professor Mike Colvin*	
Discussion	**VII. MEMBERS' ITEMS**	

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

(CAPRA)

Monday, March 2, 2009, 2:00 – 3:30PM

Room 324 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:

CAPRA2008-2009 :: Resources::MTG 03/02/2009

AGENDA

Action	Item	P.
Information	**I. CHAIR'S REPORT – PROFESSOR EVAN HEIT**	
Action	**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**	
	▪ Draft Minutes, February 9, 2009	*[tbd]*
Discussion	**III. UCM BUDGET**	
	▪ Campus Budget Committee	
	▪ Campus Budget Priorities	
	Budget Committee Guiding Principles	*1-2*
Discussion	**IV. SCHOOLS STRATEGIC PLANS**	
	Report from Members on Ongoing School Planning	
Discussion	**V. REQUEST FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS**	
	CRE asked that CAPRA review its Bylaws and list any substantive changes it feels is necessary. CRE is looking for a list of recommended changes, not a rewriting of the Bylaws at this time.	
	CRE Memo, CAPRA and system wide bylaws	*3-20*
	Bylaws from other UCs	*21-34*
Discussion	**VI. REQUESTS FROM SSHA:**	
	HISTORY HONORS TRACK PROPOSAL	*35-37*
	UGC's memo dated May 16, 2008 and revisions to SR75 are available on crops as background information. [SSHA Honors folder]	
Discussion	**VII. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY**	
	Scheduled for 3:00pm	
	▪ Campus Budget Committee	
	▪ Instructional Budget	
	▪ Schools Strategic Plans	
	▪ 2009-2010 Operating Budget	
Discussion	**VIII. MEMBERS' ITEMS**	