UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE • MERCED DIVISION

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 10, 2009

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on Thursday, September 10 2009, in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT – *Mike Colvin*

A. Chair Colvin welcomed new and returning members.
B. Role of CAPRA. Two major issues the committee will examine this year are new majors and indirect cost returns distribution.
C. Items to bring to the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB) this year. UCM is the newest UC campus so budget cuts affect the campus disproportionately. Changes in the funding formula can be more easily absorbed by the larger campuses. UCM is not fully funded for all its students. $5 million budget cuts were applied this year. It was mentioned that UC President Yudof has made a commitment to fill in that money for next year.

III. ORGANIZATION OF AY 2009-2010 MEETINGS AND MEMBERSHIP

CAPRA meetings will be every other Thursday. Additional meetings might be scheduled during the review of the Schools' Strategic Plans. In order to better suit committee members' schedules, the next CAPRA meeting will be at 1:00 pm.

Minutes will be drafted for each meeting for review and approval by the committee.

IV. FOLLOW-UP ON CAPRA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Usual CAPRA business includes the review of the Schools strategic plans. Last year, the process was undermined because half of the ongoing searches were cut due to the hiring freeze and twho of the three produced condensed strategic plans. SSHA did not submit a plan.

Last year, the EVC allocated 15 faculty lines.

CAPRA drafted a memo to the EVC on June 5, 2009 that recommended the process go back to the Deans and Schools so they can make decisions about what they want to go forward with this year. CAPRA felt that Schools could reconsider their FTE requests.

The lack of start up funding is one of the limiting factors in making successful hires so it was recommended that more LPSOEs. (Some disciplines have a large number of lower division courses that LPSOEs could teach.) Based on a meeting between DivCo and Provost Pitts, there

was hope that there would be some serious strategic planning during the summer. Instead, there have been conversations between the EVC and the Deans.

The committee discussed the searches in each School that the EVC has recommended. During the discussion of SSHA searches, the committee had a brief debate about the management major.

ACTION: Chair Colvin will summarize the aforementioned discussion in a memo, include some questions that committee members may have, and distribute to the members for review. The final memo will be forwarded to the EVC.

V. STRATEGIC PLANNING

The committee discussed the issues and challenges surrounding incoming students in impacted majors. A major component of this issue is how to get students into non-impacted majors. A possible solution is to "market" the other majors more effectively. School Strategic Plans should be more goal-oriented, i.e., Schools should state which majors they hope to have ready in the next five years and how many faculty they will need. Strategic Plans should also present trade-offs that will grow a few big majors.

In order to interest students in exploring other majors, it was suggested that UGC address recruitment issues and develop strategies for broadening the opportunities of incoming students. GRC should eventually opine on the TA population.

ACTION: Chair Colvin will draft a memo to the Schools via the EVC requesting that Schools modify the direction of their strategic planning to emphasize multi-year goals. Chair Colvin will also obtain more numbers on capacity from Institutional Planning & Analysis (IPA).

VI. INDIRECT COST RETURNS (ICR)

GRC wrote a memo to DivCo last semester proposing a policy on ICR. The spatial analysis group submitted a proposal to DivCo last semester but the proposal was tabled because UCM does not yet have a policy.

Graduate groups and Centers are requesting indirect cost return funding. The committee discussed the next steps. It was suggested that some fraction of the funds return to where the grant money originated. Another possibility is to develop a proposal-based strategic investment where groups join together and make the case for them receiving the money.

ACTION: GRC Chair Kello will act as lead reviewer of the GRC proposal in the memo.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair
Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE • MERCED DIVISION

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 24, 2009

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:00 pm on Thursday, September 24 2009, in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. CONSULTATION WITH EVC ALLEY

A. List of EVC-suggested hires. CAPRA gave EVC its feedback on the list.

EVC related the following information:
There are 122 filled faculty lines which include ladder-rank faculty and LPSOEs but exclude Lecturers. We should be able to have about 181 faculty members. There are 30 unfilled lines. There are 152 faculty lines out of approximately 181 lines that supposedly were allocated to ladder-rank faculty. 30 lines were allocated to Lecturers. Next year, assuming UCM grows by 500 students (for a total of about 3,900 students); the campus should qualify for 208 FTEs. But there are two issues. 1) $6.3 million of the campus' enrollment growth dollars came from the other campuses and is still considered temporary money. We supposedly are not allowed to hire any faculty on those dollars. 2) Off-scale salaries must be taken into account because they cut into the total salary pool.

There is more and more awareness at the Office of the President that UCM's funding model is flawed.

Chair Colvin mentioned that when CAPRA receives some estimates, it would like to send them to the Schools. In the next two weeks, the committee will forward the Schools the instructions for their strategic planning. CAPRA is hopeful that instructions will be sent to the Schools within two-three weeks.

ACTION: Chair Colvin will summarize today's discussion and forward a memo to the EVC.

III. INDIRECT COST RETURN

GRC is developing a policy for distributing indirect cost return.

IV. STRATEGIC PLANNING

The committee discussed Chair Colvin's edits to the Guiding Criteria for Evaluating Academic Plans from Schools and Graduate Groups. (Edits posted on Crops) It is CAPRA's goal to ask the Schools to begin determining what resources are available. The School strategic plans will be held to these criteria.

ACTION: Chair Colvin will make two edits to the Criteria document: 1) add a row called "EVC Target" detailing what the EVC told the Schools about how many lines and start up money they will receive. CAPRA will then evaluate the Schools' requests in comparison to EVC's targets. 2) ask Schools for Year 1 and Year 2 versions of the Table of Requested FTEs. Chair Colvin requested that committee members send him any further edits. The Criteria will be discussed at the next meeting and then sent to the Schools.

V. CAPRA-RELATED ITEMS FROM CHAIR/VICE CHAIR RETREAT (9/18/09)

Senate Vice Chair Evan Heit

- There was positive feedback about getting S&E 2 approved. It was suggested that UCM needs to continue that momentum.
- There was discussion about faculty's role on campus budget committees. In times of crisis, other campuses conduct more frequent meetings. The UCM budget committee met only once.
- President Yudof stated that if the Regents agree to a 32% fee increase, he will be able to end furloughs after one year and restore retirement contributions.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE • MERCED DIVISION

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
October 8, 2009

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:00 pm on Thursday, October 8, 2009 in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT – *Mike Colvin*

October 6, 2009 UCPB Meeting

- According to Patrick Lenz, UC Vice President for the Budget, we should request the following items from next year's budget: 1) $305 million replacement of operating money of the one-time cut; 2) $96 million allocation for the UC Retirement Program; 3) $400 million for buildings, and 4) protection of the current Cal-Grant entitlement. VP Lenz also mentioned that CSU Chancellor Charles Reed has announced plans to reduce student numbers by 30,000. That would impact the UC.
- Peter Taylor, CFO and Executive Director of External Finance, Sandra Kim gave an overview of how UC borrows money. Bottom line: they're steering a risky course. Given the seniority of UC, its historically good bond rating, and the situation with the state budget, UC could pursue a more aggressive course in terms of loans. Peter Taylor will be visiting UC Merced on October 20. Faculty hope to speak with him about the growth of the campus.
- Other topics of discussion included a consultation with the office of the Director of Institutional Research, the Education Abroad Program, and furloughs.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

Draft Minutes for the September 10 meeting
Draft Minutes for the September 24 meeting

ACTION: Chair Colvin will make a minor edit to the September 10 minutes. Committee will review both sets of minutes. If no comments are sent to Chair Colvin, the Consent Calendar is considered approved.

IV. PROPOSAL FOR DIFFERENTIAL FEES FOR UNDERGRADUATES BY DISCIPLINE

Professor Heit provided background information. The proposal seeks to increase fees on Business and Engineering majors. CAPRA discussed the proposal's pedagogical impact and the issues surrounding access.

ACTION: Chair Colvin will draft a CAPRA response to the proposal and will distribute to committee members for input. DivCo will submit a memo to OP that combines both UGC and CAPRA comments.

V. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY

A. Enrollment Growth. OP will examine UCM's enrollment growth for the next three years. They will most likely provide some level of enrollment growth support. It is estimated that there will be 600-650 new students per year for those three years.
B. S&E 2. It is the highest priority in the bond that will go to the voters November 2010. If the bond fails, the alternative is a lease revenue bond. OP has not yet accepted our five year capital plan. There is about $18 million in infrastructure to complete Phase 1 of the campus. The big piece is the $50 million that moves the infrastructure across the Bowl to Phase 2. We are being told we need to build lower cost programs and to re-think the kinds of buildings we're planning.
C. Space. A committee member asked how we are going to house the extra students the campus is going to get over the next few years. The lack of large classrooms is a problem. There was some discussion on CPEC numbers. The Space Committee still needs to meet.

ACTION: Invite Director of Capitol Planning John White to a future CAPRA meeting to discuss utilization numbers.

D. Budget. Budget Director Kathy Jefferds is planning to get the Budget Committee together. The instructional budget this year should be about $8.5 million which pays for TAs, Lecturers, and lab support.
E. Indirect Cost Return. We have to pay the debt service on what we borrowed for S&E 2. The positive news is that OP will roll the remainder of that $10 million we were going to borrow into the General Obligation bond. We are thus saved $6.3 million and it frees up some indirect cost return. The only money that's been spent from that pool is the money that goes to the GRC travel/research/shared equipment grants ($107,000).

ACTION: EVC will get numbers from Budget Director Jefferds as to the annual and total number that's in the pot for the coming year.

F. Furlough Mitigation. GRC is waiting on salary data it requested from AP. It will develop a proposal based on that data.

VI. CAPRA GUIDING CRITERIA

Chair Colvin incorporated committee members' comments. A discussion of the comments followed. During the meeting, Professor Heit emailed to members some analysis about the number of faculty in different majors. Analysis is based on what was showed to OP when they came to UCM in August (originally taken from CAPRA's spreadsheet of faculty counts).

ACTION: Chair Colvin will distribute the most recent Criteria draft to committee members. After the committee iterates by email, the draft will be forwarded to EVC Alley for additional edits. CAPRA will then forward the EVC the final version. The EVC will forward it to the Schools.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • MERCED DIVISION**

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
October 22, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:00 pm on Thursday, October 22, 2009 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report – *Mike Colvin*

Members of the Commission on the Future working groups will visit UCM on October 27. Public forums will be held with faculty, staff and students. The Commission has asked the UCM faculty to comment on their questions. The Commission has five working groups. UCM faculty assignments are as follows:
- Size and Shape: CAPRA Chair Colvin
- Education and Curriculum: UGC Chair Amussen
- Access and Affordability: Senate Vice Chair Heit
- Funding Strategies: Senate Chair Conklin
- Research Strategies: GRC Chair Kello

CAPRA members noted that the questions posed by each working group are implicit. CAPRA expressed its concern about tiering the UC system and the effect the current and future student/faculty ratio will have on the quality of the campus curriculum, research and graduate education.

Discussion to be continued during the next Division Council meeting (10/27/09).

III. Consent Calendar

If no edits are sent to Chair Colvin by the end of the week, the October 8 draft Minutes will be considered approved.

IV. Review of the CAPRA Guiding Criteria

The committee edited its criteria for reviewing the Schools strategic plans. The document will be discussed –and revised as needed- in consultation with EVC/Provost Alley.

Last year the Schools submitted condensed versions of the plans due to the hiring freeze and budget uncertainties. CAPRA is hopeful that the strategic planning process will improve this year. CAPRA may reconsider the deadline for submission of the plans (possibly late February). The committee will also address the issues of a multi-year compact and the changing of the deans in SSHA.

V. Research Metrics

CAPRA notes that discussions about research have been vague due to the absence of metrics. In several previous Senate discussions the issue has been raised of including "Research Metrics" as a complement to student numbers in evaluating resource requests, in order to evaluate the quality of

research. Furthermore, in its criteria for reviewing the Schools' academic plans, CAPRA requests the inclusion of research metrics. The only data/metric that has been used by CAPRA is student enrollment. There is some concern that research as a goal is overlooked. CAPRA should discuss what such metrics might include and how and when they should be used. This would especially be helpful for graduate programs.

Action: It was decided that GRC will discuss this further. The charge is for GRC to establish a comprehensive list of research metrics.

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

- **CAPRA Criteria**

CAPRA is hopeful that the Schools will consider two to three-year plans. Given the current budget constraints, CAPRA encourages the Schools who are proposing new majors to consider building critical mass into existing majors. This year's criteria include some language about the full life-cycle planning of existing programs. The Schools are also asked to describe plans for consolidation of programs within or between schools or between graduate groups to make the most efficient use of faculty lines. This will be particularly essential for the WASC accreditation and for program review.

The EVC reported that he recently received the revised CAPRA criteria for reviewing the strategic plans. He will review it and provide feedback to CAPRA. In terms of timeline, and given the changing of the SSHA dean, he indicated that it would make sense to push the due date for submission of the strategic plans to February with the understanding that the first cycle of review will be accelerated. The other thing that might affect the timeline is the multi-year commitment from OP. The EVC is hopeful that there will be some indication from OP about what the budget forecast for UCM will be in the next 2-3 years. The assumption is that OP will provide the enrollment support for 600 additional students each year for three years (2010-2013). After that, supplemental $5M state support will hopefully kick in.

It is expected that 25 to 45 faculty lines will be allocated across the three Schools from 2010 until 2013. The impediments are space and start-up packages. The strategic plans should include prioritized faculty lines, as well as start-up and space estimates. The Deans will receive the budget for their school for AY10-11.

CAPRA noted that there is some growing concern about the current space limitations and the prospect of accommodating 3000 students. It will become increasingly difficult for faculty to deliver instruction and conduct research with an 80:1 ratio student to faculty ratio (2000 students for 25 faculty) especially if the distribution of students across majors continues to grow disproportionately. It would be helpful to conduct some projections to see whether the campus can handle 2000 additional students into the current instructional space. (All of the models so far have been assuming a perfect distribution of students across the classrooms). The variations in class sizes will be so large that the campus' ability to fill them will be affected.

The EVC noted that he is still trying to determine how to accommodate students and faculty with the current space constraints. He noted that OP officials are considering the affordability of the campus' buildings -- classroom buildings are more cost effective that instructional and research buildings -- and

whether Merced should reconsider its capital construction priorities. For the capital budget, Merced is given a target for 5 years and another for 10 years. The campus has to follow those targets. UCM administration is currently engaged in discussions with OP to try and alter those targets.

UCM is considering general obligation bonds ($4.5 billions for 10 years) to meet the campus's needs for Phase II of the campus development. Phase II of the campus will cost at least $50M and Phase III will total about $1 billion. OP acknowledges that Merced's original funding model was not adequate from the outset.

Action: Senate Analyst to gather data on CPEC utilization numbers as student numbers grow and distribute to CAPRA.

- **Indirect Costs Returns**

The EVC reported that the ICR dollars are managed and distributed as follows:

- Off-the-top funds. 20% are used to support activities linked to support administration and research.
- Opportunity funds. 35%. A fraction of these funds is used to support building infrastructure costs and faculty start-up costs.
- General funds. 45% goes into the general funds (19933), which used to be the 19900 funds. This is used to help fund the University's budget.

About 68-70millions were generated by grants. This figure takes into account state and federal contracts. Some campuses give nothing back to replenish the pot and instead use their ICR for personnel costs and the office of research.

The EVC noted that ICR generated about $1.8million in the opportunity funds. A fraction of those dollars will be used to pay off the debt on the $10million loan for SEII and for the modular buildings. This was never part of the agreement with OP. UCM administration is currently considering how to redistribute the funds.

CAPRA noted the importance of adequately tracking ICR dollars and using a portion of those dollars to support the addition of faculty lines and strategically invest them to support graduate programs.

- **Space and Budget Committee**

The EVC reported that the Budget committee and the Space committee will convene in the near future. There is some sense of urgency for the space committee to analyze classroom and office buildings and how space will be utilized in the SSM and SEII buildings. There will be needs for office space within the three schools (space that is currently not available in SEI). The EVC is hopeful that there will be a way of recalibrating space primarily between science and engineering. Regarding the SSM building, the general expectation in SSHA is that the current occupants of COB will move to the SSM although some faculty are not planning to move. Most of the decision-making on space allocation for SSM will happen within SSHA.

- **Faculty Allocation for AY 2009-10**

The EVC has sent a memo to the three Deans regarding the AY 09-10 authorized faculty lines.

Action: Senate Analyst will request a copy of the memos and distribute to CAPRA.

VII. Graduate Groups Proposals

Guidelines for reviewing graduate groups proposals (drafted by a previous GRC chair) were previously sent to CAPRA. In AY 08-09 GRC voted to approve those guidelines. They were subsequently forwarded to Divco. Divco recommended that GRC compare those guidelines with the draft Academic Degree Program procedures established by CRE to ensure consistency of approval processes. GRC revised the procedures in March 2009 to include WASC requirements.

CAPRA recently received two graduate groups proposals. Review assignments are as follows:

-Quantitative and Systems Biology: Senate Vice Chair Heit and UGC Chair Amussen
-Cognitive and Information Sciences: CAPRA Chair Colvin and CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge.

CAPRA will mostly address resource needs. Review parameters will include consideration of the critical mass in the proposal and if it is enough to form a graduate group. Some of the factors in CAPRA's analysis may also be contingent upon decisions made about indirect costs returns.

Members will hold preliminary discussions about the proposals at the next meeting. CAPRA is hoping to provide feedback to GRC three weeks after its next meeting.

VIII. Differential Fees

UGC has opined on the differential fees proposal. CAPRA will also comment on the proposal. CAPRA's review will include a resource planning dimension.

Action: CAPRA Chair Colvin will circulate draft comments.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

Minutes prepared by Fatima Paul.
Attest: Mike Colvin, Chair

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE-MERCED DIVISION

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
November 12, 2009

I. Meeting
Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) met at 1:00pm on Thursday, November 12, in room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report- *Mike Colvin*
November 3 UCPB Meeting
Debbie Obley, Associate VP for Budget gave a presentation on the UC revenue sources. Data showed inequities across the system for student/faculty ratios.

III. Consent Calendar
- Agenda approved as presented.
- October 22 minutes will be considered approved if no comments are received by the end of the week.

IV. November 5 CPPC Meeting-*Senate Vice Chair Heit*
The role of the Campus Physical Planning Committee (CPPC) is to approve or make recommendations on major capital projects. CAPRA discussed the five-year capital request that was distributed at the November 5 meeting. All of the requests noted on the document have not yet been approved. Data shows that UCM gets 2% of the system State funded capital budget. CAPRA notes that the campus is not resourced appropriately. Clearly, the campus needs to expand but in the meantime there are several cost-effective in-field projects that could be done and would alleviate the current space shortages (i.e. expand COB). CAPRA notes that the trailers are fully assigned but are not used at full capacity. CAPRA will discuss trailers space utilization and assignments with the EVC.

V. Proposal for Differential Fees for Undergraduates by Discipline
Action: CAPRA's memo on differential fees will be circulated for edits and forwarded to Divco.

VI. Review of the CAPRA Criteria
Schools are working on their strategic plans. CAPRA reviewed its Guiding Criteria and timeline for reviewing the Schools Strategic Plans. Much of the timeline has been pushed forward a month to accommodate the interim deans. CAPRA chair added some language to the criteria about schools resource requests for program review.

VII. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley

Report: Based on calculations, 50 FTEs will be allocated to the three Schools over the next three years. Assuming that all of the current searches are successful, it would build up the faculty body to about 190 in 2013. At most campuses 70 to 80% of their faculty lines have been filled and the remaining 30-20% are filled by lecturers. The administration hopes that Merced will have the same distribution of faculty and lecturers. Budget and space are the main obstacles.

Social Sciences and Management

The Social Sciences and Management building will be ready for occupancy in 2011. This will free up about 50 offices in COB that could be used for dry labs (engineering or computational engineering). Distribution will be discussed at the school level.

The EVC asked CAPRA for input on a call that he would like to put out for one or two senior positions to address the research focus areas that are in the strategic plans and where any of the three schools can compete equitably.

The EVC asked IPA to look at the other campuses data to see which top 5 majors have the highest percentages of enrollments. He will share that data with CAPRA.

Student-Faculty Ratio

CAPRA chair presented projected student/faculty ratio using three faculty growth models. It was noted that other campuses reports on student/faculty ratios include lecturers. Data shows that UCM has the worst ratio of instructor/ladder-rank faculty. In order to have 226 faculty members in the next few years, there needs to be less lecturers hires. The main concern is related to space.

Action: Committee will refine the analysis.

General Education

CAPRA notes that the model for teaching General Education has to be reconsidered. CAPRA discussed some possible models such as the development of a track within the graduate programs in Humanities or having disciplinary-based new PhDs on three-year appointments to deliver General Education.

CAPRA Criteria

CAPRA will send its final version of the CAPRA criteria and the timeline for reviewing the plans to the EVC.

Space Committee

There is concern that space in the AOB is underutilized or miss utilized. This should be considered by the space committee. The EVC agrees that there are some areas that are not used as well as others. He has asked for cost estimates to build another set of trailers

which would provide 30% additional space. CAPRA notes that there is some concern regarding space assignments. This should be addressed by the Deans. The institutes and graduate groups should also be given the opportunity to weigh in. The space committee should consider these issues.

Budget Committee
The EVC reported that due to staff shortage in the Budget office, the Budget committee has been unable to convene.

VIII. <u>Student-Faculty Ratio</u>
CAPRA is drafting a memo to Divco about this issue. Chair Colvin has circulated a draft. Assuming a growth of student numbers of 600/year, what student/faculty ratio is the campus heading towards? The model proposed by the Administration is to hire 24-45 faculty over the next three years. CAPRA notes that the campus needs to grow by a reasonable number of students to ensure sustainability, but at the same an adequate number of faculty needs to be hired. To be sustainable in terms of the research mission, UCM will need 50-60 new faculty; however the campus will not be getting a new building in time to accommodate the new faculty hires. There was some discussion about identifying funding sources for research mobiles (which are costly). CAPRA notes that it would be useful to ask the Schools which disciplines/research programs they can grow with the current limited resources and space constraints.

The EVC is working on a three-year call and there is some analysis that can be done now based on student/faculty ratios and ladder-rank/instructors ratios. Further analyses on space needs to be done. The different groups need to have a better sense of what they have and what can be done.

CAPRA will recommend that the administration collaborate with the Deans and the units.

CAPRA will write a memo to Divco. Divco will pass on CAPRA's recommendation to the EVC.

CAPRA will discuss this further over email.

IX. <u>Research Metrics</u>
GRC is currently discussing this issue.

X. <u>Graduate Groups Proposals</u>
A. QSB
Reviewers: Senate vice chair Heit and UGC chair Amussen.
Draft comments are posted on crops. Final version of the comments will be sent to GRC.

B. COGS
Reviewers: Chair Colvin and vice chair Rogge.
Initial set of comments on the COGS proposal are posted on crops.
CAPRA discussed the issue of the Master's degree not being included in the proposal. CAPRA acknowledges that this is an interdisciplinary program and recommends the addition of some language to the proposal to explain the options available to students to obtain a Master's degree in one of the related Master's programs.

Draft comments will be circulated within CAPRA. Final comments will be sent to GRC. GRC Chair Kello will check with WASC steering committee coordinator Dunn-Haley on how to complete the submittal to WASC.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair
Minutes prepared by Fatima Paul.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE-MERCED DIVISION

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
December 10, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) met at 1:00pm on Thursday, December 10, in room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report

December 8 UCPB Meeting- Report from UCPB Vice Chair Evan Heit

- UCPB, UCAP and UCFW are working on a joint letter on faculty salary scales that will be sent to the systemwide Academic Senate. The letter will emphasize the importance of restoring the faculty salary scales as a priority.
- Discussion about non-resident enrollment. Some think that increasing non-resident enrollment is a way for the University to generate more revenue; however this practice changes the character of the UC mission as a public university. The general question is where does the money go? The State will pay a campus $10K/per student for resident students and resident students pay about $10K in fees. For non-resident students, campuses do not get the $10K from the State but non-resident students have to pay $30K so basically campuses have a $10K incentive to bring in non-resident students if they get to keep all the money. Until three years ago, everything was funneled through UCOP and campuses did not get to keep their money but this has recently been changed so the campuses are allowed to keep all NRT revenue. If campuses are allowed to take in as many non-resident students as they want, the poorly funded students will be shifted to other campuses. CAPRA will discuss this issue with Brian Gresham, member of the Commission on the Future Funding Strategies working group.
- UCPB discussed the reports the committee wrote in 2006 and in 2008: the Futures Reports and the Cuts Report. Those reports predicting the future of the UC budget crisis. UCPB is currently drafting the "Choices Report".

III. Consent Calendar

- Agenda approved as presented.
- November 12 Meeting Minutes will be considered approved if no comments are received by the end of the week.

IV. Graduate Groups Proposals

A. QSB

Reviewers: Senate vice chair Heit and UGC chair Amussen.

Draft comments are posted on crops. Final version of the comments will be sent to GRC.

Preliminary comments:

- The resource requests seem reasonable.
- The space needs issues need to be further defined. Would it be helpful for QSB to get more commitment from the Deans?
- Teaching configuration: graduate courses are piggy-backed on undergraduate courses. Reviewers would like to recommend explicit planning to separate those courses.
- Resource needs that will support both the WASC review and program assessment of a Master's and PhD need to be identified.

Action: CAPRA final comments will be forwarded to GRC. GRC will send combined comments (GRC and CAPRA's) to the QSB group.
Action: CAPRA would like to see the proposal again.

B. COGS
Reviewers: Chair Colvin and vice chair Rogge.
Draft comments were circulated prior to today's meeting.

Action: CAPRA chair will send final draft to GRC.
CAPRA agreed not to revisit the proposal again.

V. <u>Proposals to Establish ORUs</u>
ORUs require external reviews and are campus wide. CRUs are individualized by campus.

CAPRA will use the ORU review procedures established by a previous GRC.

A. Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI)
Reviewers: UGC Chair Susan Amussen and CAPRA Vice Chair Wolfgang Rogge

B. UC Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI)
Senate Vice Chair Evan Heit and CAPRA Chair Mike Colvin

CAPRA notes that both proposals have significant resource requests.
During its review of both proposals, CAPRA will consider the following:
- What funds are available?
- How much is requested?
- Where do funds come from?

CAPRA would like to get some comparative information from the SNRI budget to better assess the resource requests in the HSRI and MERI proposals.

Action: Senate analyst will request a copy of the SNRI budget from VCR Traina.

VI. Memo to GRC on Criteria for Evaluating Research Excellence
CAPRA charged GRC to develop some research metrics.
CAPRA has drafted a memo to GRC. Members reviewed the memo and approved it.

Action: CAPRA chair will send the memo to GRC.

VII. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley
Budget Committee
The budget committee will convene in January 2010. The budget call will be sent to the units earlier this year.

Space Committee
CAPRA and the EVC discussed space issues. Faculty are concerned about the lack of planning for new buildings and how space will be assigned for the different groups. The EVC reported that this has to be addressed by the space committee. The space committee needs to work on reconciling all the existing space between the Schools. This is a priority. CAPRA would like to know how space will be assigned for SEI, SEII, SSM, Castle, COB and who is responsible for making those decisions. CAPRA wonders if it would make sense to constitute a committee that would have a global oversight on all of these space issues. Such a committee would also help address issues associated with the Surge building.

The EVC is concerned about wasting faculty time on more committees. He is also worried about how such a committee would interpret the information.

Faculty Hires
The EVC noted that no more than 50 faculty should be hired during the next three years.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair
Minutes prepared by Fatima Paul.

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
January 7, 2010

I. CHAIR'S REPORT

SNS ARPC Questions on CAPRA Criteria and EVC Memo
The SNS ARPC had a few questions related to the CAPRA criteria: the CAPRA criteria lay out a two-year plan and the EVC's memo suggested a three-year timescale which fits with the compact for 50 faculty lines.
Action: CAPRA chair will draft a memo and will circulate within CAPRA. In its memo, CAPRA will request a three-year plan, to be consistent with the EVC's request. Final draft will go to the Schools.

President Yudof Intermediate Term Building
Action: Chair Colvin will convey CAPRA's space concerns during the next instructional space planning meeting.

II. PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS (ORUS)
CAPRA (and GRC) received two ORU proposals:

A. **UCM Energy Research Institute (MERI)**
Reviewers: Senate Vice Chair Heit and CAPRA Chair Colvin
Although CAPRA acknowledges that this could be a highly productive ORU and that this type of research activity could greatly benefit the Central Valley, the committee noted the following:

- Sources of funding are not clearly identified
- There is a fairly significant resource request with $137000 in the first year going up to $400000 by the third year. It is not clear how the ORU will leverage resources.
- There is some support from United Health ($10M) – Are those funds still available or is the proposal requesting different funds?
- If a proposal has already identified some external source of funding, it would make it easy for CAPRA to support such a proposal. CAPRA will look at the SNRI budget and use it as a possible model (posted on crops).
- The proposal describes some initiatives (i.e. establishing new curriculums, teaching people how to install solar equipment) – these activities do not seem essential to having a research institute. Money is requested for summer salary. The proposal doesn't clearly state how the money will be used to support research.
- It is worth noting that the importance to the area is critical. Can some of the funds requested be used to boost the research of junior faculty and/or graduate students?

- It is not clear how funding requests are going to support research and curriculum.

B. Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI)
Reviewers: UGC Chair Amussen and CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge

Tabled for discussion at the next meeting.

III. UCOF (FUNDING STRATEGIES)
Guest: Brian Gresham, UCM representative on the Funding Strategies Gould Commission subgroup
Brian Gresham reported on the following:

The first official meeting of the Funding Strategies workgroup was in November. The group met to bring everyone up-to-date on the issue. At this point the last two sessions were spent brainstorming ideas to give everyone a sense of which ideas could make an impact on UCM's funding strategies. The workgroup identified 30 topics worth considering. There is hope that the spring deadline will be extended.
Access and Affordability is extremely tied to Funding Strategies. The Executive staff at OP is doing their best to keep the different groups connected. There is increasing acknowledgement at OP that Merced will continue to require special funding.

CAPRA is concerned that the Commission is considering the implementation of differential fees across the system, which would put Merced at a serious disadvantage.

Action: Brian Gresham will update CAPRA later in the spring.
Action: Senate Analyst will send the Senate and UGC's comments on the Differential Fees proposal to Brian Gresham.

IV. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY
The EVC reported on the following:

ICR - The EVC indicated that he has requested some data on ICR from the Budget Office and will report to CAPRA when the report is available.

UCOF - Size and Shape – Members of the working group include a former budget director and a former state assemblyman and they are very vocal about funding issues. CA is producing a million less baccalaureate-trained individuals. There is a lot of modeling that needs to be done and there is a lack of solid information. In the next two-three years, it is estimated that there will be a million tech jobs created.

ORUs Proposals – CAPRA noted that it would be helpful to have the Budget Committee consider issues surrounding funding sources.

Graduate Support - In order to be a doctoral university, every institution needs to award at least twenty PhDs a year. It took UCSC nine years to get to 20/year. They awarded 17 PhDs in their eight year. UCM is not included in current data analysis but will be in the 15th portrayal which will include data for 2013-2014. In the Sciences, in order to create a well-functioning research program, you need to have three graduate students per faculty. Looking at our current enrollment and the number of faculty in Sciences (75), it is clear that we are not investing enough in graduate education.

A task force on graduate enrollment was set up by VCR Traina and is currently addressing graduate support issues. Members of the task force include Professors A.M. Kelley, Quinn, Kello, Lopez-Calvo and Coimbra. It was noted that the task force doesn't include members of QSB. CAPRA chair Colvin will send suggestions to the task force.

Intermediate Term Academic Building - The EVC will attend a meeting with administrators and faculty tomorrow to consider space priorities. Plans need to include some classroom space, some dry lab space for graduate students and office space for administrators and faculty.

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

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
January 21, 2010

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00 p.m. on January 21, 2010 in Room 324 of the Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Colvin updated the committee on the topics raised during the last Space Instructional Meeting:

- Graduate student numbers and the need for growth, graduate support, space for graduate students.
- Academic Surge Building ("Bonus Building") – UCOP has proposed approximately $20 million to support funding for pedagogical and academic space at UCM. The project will include classroom space, "dry space", graduate students workspace, academic and administrative office space and tutoring space.

III. MINUTES OF MEETING

- Agenda was approved as presented.
- The January 7 Meeting Minutes will be considered approved if no comments are received by January 22.

IV. CAPRA'S ROLE IN INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

During the last Divco meeting, a member stated her concern about next year's student numbers and suggested that the Schools hire adjunct assistant professors and possibly lecturers and TAs. It was suggested that CAPRA could lead the way in providing some sort of framework.

CAPRA members expressed their concern about engaging in the trend of bringing faculty who are on a non-tenured track. Furthermore, it does not seem useful for CAPRA to be micro-managing the Schools' decisions regarding enrollment. Members agreed to discuss this further during their consultation with the EVC/Provost.

V. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY

CAPRA members expressed their concern about the following:

- Process and strategies to address enrollment management issues.
- Role of the administration vs. faculty in regards to decision-making for enrollment management.
- How to maintain the balance of student numbers between the different majors.

- Senate role in regards to space planning issues and the Academic Surge Building.

The EVC reported on the following:
-He has received a request from VCSA Lawrence regarding the establishment of an Enrollment Management Committee. Membership will include faculty members. He is currently drafting a charter for this committee which he will share with CAPRA at the next meeting.
-The Sociology major is nearing approval.
-The campus needs majors that will attract prospective students (i.e. ecology, environmental sciences or sustainability).
-Space: Academic Surge Building ("Bonus Building") – Membership of the Building Advisory Committee will include VCA Miller (Chair), the three deans, three faculty representatives and the AVC for Student Affairs. Possible locations of the building are the "Triangle", the parking lot next to SEII or behind the water tank, next to Facilities. The campus architect wants to add a wing onto the back of COB.

Action: The EVC will forward the charter of the Academic Surge Building – Advisory Planning Committee to the Senate. A formal request for three senate representatives will also be sent to the Senate office.

SSHA Instructional Budget
CAPRA and the EVC discussed the SSHA instructional budget and measures that could be implemented to balance it, such as trading funding for lecturers for TAs positions. It was noted that the budget of the writing program comes out of the SSHA instructional budget. The EVC noted that it would be useful if CAPRA, in addition to the Budget Committee, explored the Schools instructional budget.

Growth of Graduate Programs
The EVC/Provost noted that he is committed to the growth of graduate programs. The number of graduate applications has slightly increased this year, in comparison to last year. A task force on graduate enrollment management has been established by VCR Traina. Members of the task force are considering ways to address graduate enrollment issues.
CAPRA suggested that the task force could analyze various alternatives for shaping future campus enrollments. CAPRA is hoping that both the graduate and the undergraduate enrollment management task forces will communicate.

Frozen Faculty Lines
The EVC reported that he does not expect the five frozen faculty lines to be included in the strategic plans. A separate call with specific parameters will go out to the Schools. He is hopeful that the Schools will strategically reshuffle their requests. With regards to future faculty lines (50), no more than 25 will be authorized next year and the remaining lines will be authorized over the next two years.

Some CAPRA members favor front-loading tenured searches because they usually take a couple of years to fill and also due to the current shortage of tenured faculty. Furthermore, front-loading allows the campus to hire couples and cohorts which provides more flexibility.

VI. PROPOSALS TO ESTABLISH ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS

A. Health Sciences Research Institutes (HSRI)
Reviewers: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge and UGC Chair Amussen

B. UC Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI)
Reviewers: CAPRA Chair Colvin and Senate Vice Chair Heit

Members will finalize comments during the next CAPRA meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for February 4, 2010.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul.

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
February 4, 2010

I. Meeting
Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00 p.m. on February 4, 2010 in Room 324 of the Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report
Chair Colvin updated members on the following:

- UCPB Meeting (February 2, 2010). Funding status of and future commitments associated with UCRP. The deficit is growing and will affect future building plans. Some strategies are being considered to help redress the deficit. Vice President Patrick Lenz gave a report on the current budget crisis. He noted his concern about the "Student Protection Act", which would require UC and CSU to cap student fee increases at a maximum of 10% per year, and provide a 180-day waiting period for any increases. However, given budget uncertainties and no firm calendar for the state's allocation, it is unclear whether such a six month waiting period could ever be implemented, or when it would commence.
- Report from George Blumenthal, UCSC Chancellor and co-chair on the Size and Shape working group. Blumenthal is confident that Size and Shape will not take radical action even though there are worries about differential fees.
- Report from Peter Krapp, UCPB Chair and member of the Funding Strategies working group: The working group is focusing on methods for raising fees and stratifying the system in a few ways. Merced would be negatively impacted by that. The two working groups are pushing for different agendas.
- UCOP Feb 25 Visit – Talking points:
  - UCOP wants to know the "true" cost of Merced (Campus realignment costs, university development).
  - The Senate will consider different scenarios that would allow Merced to reach a sustainable level in terms of academic programs and faculty. The Merced Senate leadership will give a presentation during the meeting.
  - The campus needs 90 to a 100 faculty lines next year.
  - Limitations are imposed on start-up packages.
  - The surge building is going to be critical. It was noted that the first meeting of the Building Planning Committee is scheduled for Thursday, February 11.
  - UCM Senate leadership presentation on 2/25 will include the following:

    --Original proposal for UCM faculty numbers vs. current numbers.
    --Faculty/student ratios (the ratio at a "regular" UC campus is 18.7/1)
    --TAs, Lecturers and student numbers. Merced has an increasing number of Lecturers and hopes to increase the number of graduate students. Given the campus' reliance on Lecturers, they could be placed in strategic areas.

This will be discussed further at the next Divco meeting.

III. Consent Calendar

- Agenda approved as presented
- January 21 Meeting Minutes will be considered approved if no comments are received by the end of week.

IV. ORU Proposals

A. Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI)

Reviewers: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge and UGC Chair Amussen

Preliminary comments:

- The proposal needs to be more specific in terms of how it will improve teaching
- There is no research plan and no clear sense of how any research would happen because of the ORU. The added value of the institute is not clear
- A large fraction of budget is allocated for facilities. How will the budget affect funding for graduate support? Is the establishment of this ORU the best way to use funds to support growing the research endeavor? There is very little seed funding available for graduate education.
- Lack of a clear theme and too much overlap

Additional comments are due to CAPRA Chair by Thursday, February 11. Final CAPRA comments will go to GRC.

B. **Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI)**

Reviewers: CAPRA Chair Colvin and Senate Vice Chair Heit

The MERI proposal will be discussed at the next CAPRA meeting (February 18).

V. Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley

Enrollment Management Council - The EVC distributed a draft charter for the Enrollment Management Council and asked CAPRA to review it and send him their comments.

Differential Fees - The UCM administration has met with some members of the Funding Strategies and the Research Strategies working groups. The EVC reported that EVCs across the system are opposed to Differential Fees. The implementation of Differential Fees would greatly diminish the respect for the three smaller campuses. He noted that across CA, there are six UC campuses, Caltech and USC that are members of the AAU. The Senate Chair and Vice Chair will discuss this further during their meeting with the Chancellor on Tuesday.

CAPRA Chair noted that the system wide Senate is currently writing a position paper that will be sent out to all the Divisions.

Action: CAPRA will write a memo to Divco to be submitted to the EVC and the Chancellor that expresses CAPRA's concern about stratification across the system.

UCOP Visit on 2/25 - The UCM administration will meet next week to talk about planning for the visit. CAPRA noted that it is important to state that Merced needs 226 faculty to achieve sustainable growth. The EVC indicated that he is working on projections for 2010-11. He also noted with the assumption that Merced reaches its enrollment target, the campus should generate between $10-11million in new revenue. If UCOP gives UCM enrollment growth dollars, the campus will get an additional $6million in new revenue. With the continuation of the $5million supplemental allocation from the State, the campus will end up with $16.9million in new revenue next year ($8million is already committed to faculty hires, $1.8million to retirement funds, and $2-3million for staff hires). ~~We~~ also need to take into account Instructional operational budgets ~~also need to be~~ taken into account.

School of Management - Looking at enrollment and applications numbers, CAPRA notes that it will be difficult to accommodate 2000 students next year. Management is an area that is particularly worrisome. The Management program had a large enrollment during its first year and there is now a strategic plan to make it a multi-school program. CAPRA discussed the pros and cons of such a plan and noted that an agreement across the Schools needs to be established. The EVC noted that there are two competing philosophies: business economics and the global interdisciplinary approach to management (entrepreneurship, natural resources management). CAPRA noted that the traditional management faculty is missing.

The EVC indicated that Management could be part of another School's plan and has to fit in the totality of the institution. Having some introduction to principles of management would be of great value. There are some areas in social sciences that do belong in the management program (e.g. behavior, population dynamics, sociology). It would be helpful to involve the other Schools in the Management major.

This will be discussed further by CAPRA.

Surge Building - The planning committee meets next week. Architects are still debating the future location of the building. It was noted that the building planning committee will have input in selecting the site. The EVC and/or VCA will make the final decision.

This will be discussed further at future CAPRA meetings.

VI. <u>Review of UCM Bylaws</u>

Divco agreed to delay the deadline for response. CAPRA Chair will circulate a list of preliminary comments about the CAPRA section of the Bylaws.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for February 18, 2010.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul.

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
March 4, 2010

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00 p.m. on March 4, 2010 in Room 324 of the Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Colvin updated members on the topics discussed at the last Space Instructional Meeting.

Main topics at the March 2 UCPB Meeting:
- Post Employment Benefits
- Recommendations from the various Gould Commission working groups that are related to stratification of the UC system

III. Consent Calendar

- Agenda was approved as presented.

IV. Follow-up on the 2/25 Meeting with UCOP Officials

- **UC Merced Compact**

Interim Provost Pitts suggested that Merced should prepare the first draft of the Compact using two scenarios: 1) addition of 50 faculty lines over the next three years and 2) addition of 85-100 faculty lines during the next three years. CAPRA Chair Colvin suggested that CAPRA work with the Deans and the different planning groups within the three Schools to develop those two plans. CAPRA will consider the cost of scenario number two.

Chair Colvin reported that UCOP officials are interested in working with Merced to find a solution to its issues. There was no discussion of allocation of additional money to the campus. Most of the discussion was about the plan to push the faculty lines up from 50 to an additional 85-100 and to hire about 226 faculty within the next three years. In regards to the cost of start-ups for the additional faculty, Provost Pitts suggested a loan from UCOP which Merced would pay out of its ICR pool (about $3million/year totaling $36million over 20 years for 86 faculty). Provost Pitts requested a plan that delineates the qualitative difference between 50 and 86 faculty hires. OP has asked Merced to conduct an analysis of the campus' academic needs and to consider possible trade-offs in research areas. Provost Pitts also suggested that Merced delay the construction of the Surge building. The faculty backed away from this idea.

- **Start-up Costs**

The usual formula at UCM is $200,000 for SSHA, $500,000 for Engineering and $700,000 for Natural Sciences faculty. The campus needs funds for about 70 faculty. CAPRA would like to

get estimates of current and future costs of additional faculty start-ups. CAPRA notes that the additional faculty lines will qualitatively change the campus' ability to grow excellent academic and research programs. The argument cannot be solely based on student/faculty ratios. As part of the planning process, Chair Colvin has drafted a memo to be sent out to the Deans and chairs of the Schools asking them for input. CAPRA and Divco need to put together an alternate plan to get commitment from UCOP and senior UCM management needs to make a compelling case about what has to be done.

Action: CAPRA Chair will add some language to the CAPRA memo to the Schools to remind them to submit their plans and to request input on the proposed hiring plans (50 vs. 86-100) and how these plans would qualitatively change research areas and impact the viability of some programs. The addition of some projections for space and start-up needs would also be helpful. CAPRA will start to put together a justification and argument for a larger group of faculty.

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

Strategic Plans
The EVC has not received the Schools strategic plans.

Indirect Costs
On July 1 all indirect costs might be returned to campuses; however this is still unclear because the taxing system has not yet been figured out. This academic year UCM collected $1.7million in student aid just based on enrollment.

Faculty Hires
Plans to justify larger faculty hiring: The EVC noted that in order to hire a larger number of faculty, the campus would need about $36million which is the total start-up costs for 86 faculty lines. OP indicated that they will give the campus $36million over the course of three years (6-12-18) and if UCM would rather have the money front-loaded, the most they could give the campus the first year is $9million. If Merced were to hire 86 faculty, it would need to use funds from its operational budget for faculty salaries and it would have to borrow up to about $36million for the start-up costs for all those faculty. Commercial paper has a very short duration but the rates are low, so if UCM borrowed $36million on commercial paper, it would end up paying more debt service (about $4million/year for 10 years with a 2.5% interest rate). Borrowing longer term bonds would cost the campus about $3.2million/year for 20 years). OP hopes to present the Compact at the May Regents meeting as an informational piece. The Compact will not require any regental action. The EVC welcomes the idea of hiring a larger group of faculty as long as the budget is balanced and faculty acknowledge the space realities.

Space
OP will put forth a lease revenue bond for SEII which will be voted on by the Legislature. If the bill passes, the building could be inhabited by fall 2014. The argument at UCOP is that some of the money for the surge building should be used to pay off some mitigation costs for the next

three years ($3-5million). Funds for the infrastructure costs are part of the infrastructural capital. They are included in the 10-year capital plan but not in the lease revenue bond.
The EVC noted that plans for the Surge building do not affect renovation plans for Castle.

Action: Divco will meet with the Chancellor to discuss his upcoming presentation at the Regents meeting.

Action: Divco will draft a memo to the administration about the Academic Surge Building.

CAPRA notes that the Senate has previously suggested that the UCM Office of Capital Planning consult with the Registrar and the Deans to get an assessment of space needs and analyze ways to maximize space and to provide feedback to the Senate.

Enrollment Management Committee
CAPRA is reviewing the charge and will provide feedback to the EVC.

Compact
The EVC will meet with the Senate chair and vice chair to discuss the Compact.

VI. <u>Proposals to Establish Organized Research Units</u>

A. UC Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI)
Reviewers: Senate Vice Chair Heit and CAPRA Chair Colvin

B. Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI)
Action: Chair Colvin will circulate draft CAPRA comments this week.

VII. <u>Review of UCM Bylaws</u>
Membership:
CAPRA suggests including on CAPRA both the GRC and UGC chairs and one other member from each committee. This would mean that the chairs would participate in the discussion but would not be obliged to be as heavily involved in the CAPRA duties. This would also give longer tenures on CAPRA to faculty who follow the usual progression from vice chair to chair on UGC and GRC.
CoC:
Given that CAPRA members are selected by CoC, CAPRA has also reviewed the proposed changes for CoC's role. Currently, all of CoC's actions must be approved by Divco. Under the proposal, CoC acts completely unilaterally. CAPRA suggests that an intermediate position between these two extremes should be crafted.

VIII. <u>CAPRA Memo to Divco on Differential Fees</u>
To be discussed at the next meeting.

IX. Systemwide Review Items
UCPB Position Paper on Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition
Comments are due by April 1, 2010.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul.

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, March 18, 2010

I. Meeting
Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00pm on March 18, 2010, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report – *Mike Colvin*
Chair Colvin will draft a letter to the Deans to inquire about the status of their strategic plans and remind them that their requests should be based on 50 faculty lines. Chair Colvin to write a memo to the EVC to ask him if the request for the plans should originate from his office or from CAPRA.

III. Consent Calendar
Agenda approved as presented.

IV. Proposals to Establish Organized Research Units (ORUs)

A. UC Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI)
Reviewers: Senate Vice Chair Heit and CAPRA Chair Colvin

B. Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI)
Reviewers: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge and UGC Chair Amussen

Draft comments were circulated prior to today's meeting.

Action: Senate Analyst will send CAPRA's comments to GRC.

V. Proposals to Establish Centralized Research Units (CRUs)

A. Spatial Analysis and Research Center (SPARC)
Lead reviewer: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge
Second reviewer: Senate Vice Chair Heit

Reviewers will send their comments to CAPRA before April 8.
The SPARC proposal includes a proposal for a Geography and Spatial Analysis minor. CAPRA recommends that the minor be submitted to the Senate through the usual steps. Senate analyst will contact the SPARC group.

B. Center for Autonomous and Interactive Systems (CAIS)
It was agreed that the proposal will be sent back to GRC for review as it does not include a request for resources.

VI. Review of the Revised QSB Proposal

Reviewers: Senate Vice Chair Heit and UGC Chair Amussen
Comments will be submitted to GRC before March 30, 2010.

VII. <u>CAPRA Memo on Differential Fees</u>
No action taken. The Gould Commission recommendations will be announced next week.

VIII. <u>Proposal for New Minors</u>

A. Environmental Science and Sustainability
B. Interdisciplinary Public Health

CAPRA recommends approval of the two proposed minors.
Action: Divco will write a memo to EVC Alley and VPUE Viney to inform them of the Senate's approval of the two minors.

IX. <u>ORUs Draft Review Policy</u>
Action requested: CAPRA to review and make recommendations to Divco on draft ORU Review Policy. Approved policy will be distributed to the Schools and graduate groups.

This item is tabled for discussion at the next meeting.

X. <u>Systemwide Review Items</u>

A. UCPB Position Paper on Differential Fees

Action requested: CAPRA to draft memo to Divco to express the committee's concerns about stratification across the system. Divco will in turn draft a memo to pass on to the Chancellor and the EVC. Comments are due to Divco by April 1, 2010.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

Attest:
Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
April 8, 2010

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00 p.m. on April 8, 2010 in Room 324 of the Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report

April 6 UCPB Meeting

Discussion about the March 31 Budget Retreat with Provost Pitts, the Academic Council and the administration. The purpose of the Retreat was to identify areas for budget cuts and to manage the budget crisis. Provost Pitts asked every UC campus to send suggestions for significant budget cuts. Due to the current crisis at UCM, CAPRA agreed that the only ways funds could be saved is by establishing a reliable research accounting scheme, by improving the timeliness of research grant accounting to minimize unspent balances that must be returned to granting agencies, and losing UCM indirect costs which could help with the research budgets.

Additional suggestions:

- Restructure senior management
- Combine the Library and IT. Put them both under the charge of the University Librarian and focus on the academic mission of UCM

Schools Strategic Plans

CAPRA has received the School of Natural Sciences' plan. CAPRA hopes to receive the Engineering and SSHA plans soon. CAPRA will ask the Deans to include an explicit vote from the faculty in the plans.

III. Consent Calendar

Agenda approved as presented.
March 18 Meeting Minutes will be considered approved if no comments are received by the end of the week.

IV. Report from the March 18 CPPC Meeting – Senate Chair Conklin

Academic Surge Building

UCOP has guaranteed $20 million for the Surge building but there is now talk about the possibility of a one-year delay for the building to try to get State funding for $35 million.

V. ORUs and CRUs Policies and Procedures

CAPRA notes that the proposal for a Psychology graduate group was delayed last year because the sources of funding were not clearly identified. For this reason, all proposals should include a letter from the Deans and the EVC and they should also indicate how the proposals fit into the budget. Not knowing the budget for those proposals makes it difficult to evaluate them.
During its review, CAPRA will consider the budget in terms of its efficiency towards the research center, if the need for a center is well justified, and if the funding streams are clearly identified and available. There was also some discussion about a possible revision of all existing CRUs and ORUs.

Recommendation: CAPRA would like to be cognizant of the budget for all proposals submitted to the Senate.

VI. <u>Proposals to Establish CRUs</u>

A. Spatial Analysis and Research Center
Lead reviewer: Vice Chair Rogge
Second reviewer: Senate Vice Chair Heit

CAPRA agreed to table this for discussion at the next meeting.

VII. <u>Proposal for a Psychological Sciences Graduate Group</u>
Reviewers: CAPRA Chair Colvin and UGC Chair Amussen
This proposal was reviewed by CAPRA last year.

Action: Senate analyst will send the January 2009 CAPRA comments to Professor Amussen and Chair Colvin

VIII. <u>Schools Strategic Plans</u>
Review assignments are as follows:

Natural Sciences
Lead reviewer: UGC Chair Amussen
Second reviewer: Vice Chair Rogge

SSHA
Lead: CAPRA Chair Colvin
Second: Senate Chair Conklin

Engineering
Senate Vice Chair Heit and GRC Chair Kello

IX. <u>Consultation with EVC/Provost Alley</u>
UCM Compact with UCOP - A letter from Provost Pitts is forthcoming.

CAPRA noted its concern about enabling the campus to achieve sustainable growth given the current student/faculty ratio.

Space - The EVC outlined the possible options for classroom space:

- Room 355 (events room) fits 100+ seats
- Room 222 (currently staff offices) could be reconfigured
- There are two large rooms across from the bookstore
- With the opening of the Social Sciences and Management (SSM) building, there will be a possibility of using the two classrooms that are currently used for Arts and Anthropology (200+ seats). The EVC will consider the cost of reconfiguring the rooms.
- A 60+ seats classroom in SSM will be ready for use in 2011.

- Laboratory space will become an issue. Course scheduling will need to be revisited.
- An architect has been selected for the construction of the Surge Building. Location of the building has not yet been determined.
- SEII: Regents approved the design of the building.
-EVC will meet with the Registrar next week to evaluate and analyze space and its utilization.

Engineering Dean Search-The Engineering Dean search is going forward. A series of off-campus interviews has been scheduled. The pool has 49 candidates and it includes a mix of UC and non-UC applicants. The new ENG Dean will start in January 2011.

Schools Instructional Budget-The EVC report that UCM has grown by an algorithm based on the number of students. The same model applies to the Schools' instructional budgets. Last year an additional $1 million dollars was allocated to the Schools because of the lottery money. The amount of the instructional budget this year is $1.4 million plus the $1 million from the lottery.

CAPRA noted that there is a lack of confidence among faculty. The distribution across the three Schools is unequal. Some Schools have been running a deficit and others have not.

The EVC is conferring with the Deans to assess the situation and see how money can be used effectively.

CAPRA expressed its interest in being involved in the process.

CAPRA Comments on the Enrollment Management Committee Charter

- The proposed charter needs a specific charge with membership listed (SACA is a good model)
- This is an administrative committee that has a Senate representative as opposed to being a Senate/administrative committee.

Action: CAPRA comments will be forwarded to the EVC.

Strategic Initiative Hires - The EVC asked CAPRA to consider ways where we would arrive at a set of common goals. Do we have a common goal? Part of this would involve determining a vision for the campus. Given the chronic budgetary problems, there will be more pressure on

campuses to eliminate redundancies, especially at the graduate level. At some institutions, the Legislature went through a review process and eliminated some graduate programs. This could happen to Merced if programs are not realigned.

X. System wide Review Items

Due to time constraints, the following will be discussed at the next meeting:

A. UCFW/TIFR Recommendation to Assure Adequate Funding for UCRP

Draft Divco comments are available on crops

Comments are due to the system wide Academic Senate by May 3, 2010

B. The Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units

Comments are due to the Senate Office by May 10, 2010

- Transmittal Letter

- Revised Compendium

- Report from the Task Force on the Compendium

C. UCOF Review

Divisions are asked to use the template distributed by vice chair Simmons.

Template is available on crops: April 8 meeting folder/System wide Review Items/UCOF Review.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next CAPRA meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2010.

Attest:

Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul.

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010

I. Meeting
Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 1:00pm on May 6, 2010, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Chair's Report
The UCPB report was deferred until the next CAPRA meeting.

III. Consent Calendar
Agenda approved as presented.

IV. Review of Schools Strategic Plans
Chair Colvin outlined the review process: CAPRA's charge is to review the hiring plans based on the appendices provided by the Schools. It is the Schools' responsibility to prioritize their faculty requests. CAPRA's goal is to evaluate the hiring plans based on the committee's criteria, in consultation with the EVC. The plans should indicate that there was a specific faculty vote. The key issue is the idea that the Schools can support the addition of 1800 students over the next three years. Nonetheless, all the aspects of the School plans are also important. Merced has to put together a plan that would allow sustained growth and if this is not accomplished, it would put Merced in a very difficult predicament. CAPRA's goal is to review the plans and point out elements that are not reasonable.

CAPRA Chair shared some enrollment data with members. SIRs are 30% higher than last year. Data related to student credit hours by prefix for senate and non-senate members will be distributed after today's meeting.

A. **School of Engineering**
Reviewers: Senate vice chair Evan Heit and GRC Chair Kello
Senate vice chair Heit comments were distributed prior to today's meeting.
Report: The SOE plan is organized. It includes a matrix for teaching and research and includes measurable outcomes. There is a good balance between research in undergraduate and graduate education. The plan was voted on unanimously by the faculty. CAPRA was told by the EVC that three lines will be allocated to the School next year. In its plan, the School requests five ladder-rank faculty, three LPSOEs and three cross-listed positions.

General Comments/Questions from the Committee:
- The top five requests are not prioritized
- Does SOE have a preference for LPSOE vs. ladder-rank faculty?

- There are three cross-listed positions – how are they ranked in relation to the other requests? Is there any agreement with the other School? Cross listed positions should appear on both plans
- MSE and BIOE are low-enrollment programs. Could the searches for these disciplines be deferred? CAPRA assumes that the BIOE line is included in the School plan to replace a faculty member who left the campus last year. CAPRA is very supportive of BIOE and notes that the program needs a plan and some leadership. CAPRA also notes that MSE is the smallest major in terms of SIRs, student majors and credit hours taught
- Priority 1 requests are not ranked (possibly due to the changing of the Deans)
- The plan needs to include some clarification about space needs and location. It should also include a global prioritization of cross-listed positions, space and LPSOEs
- What is the status of the current searches and how do they affect the FTEs requests?

Action: Senate Vice Chair Heit will circulate his comments on the SOE plan to the committee. Chair Colvin will forward them to the School. CAPRA will revisit the SOE plan upon receiving feedback from the School. CAPRA will also request some clarification from the School about the level of priority of the BIOE search.

B. School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

Lead reviewer: CAPRA Chair Colvin
Second reviewer: Senate Chair Conklin (absent-Senate Chair Conklin's comments will be forwarded to Chair Colvin).

Report: Two of the proposed eleven priorities (Heritage management and conservation and Literature/Spanish linguistics) are listed under primary majors that do not exist (World Heritage and Spanish). CAPRA notes that the Spanish minor could possibly fit into Literature. In the World Heritage portion of the plan, the idea is for the minors in Writing and Spanish to merge with Literature and split into two majors but that has not yet been approved by the School. The Management program has only 32 SIRs. Are there any plans to make the major more attractive to students? CAPRA also notes that the 2010-11 FTE requests do not include lines for the History major. Based on student numbers, it would be logical to request (a) line(s) for the History major. There was some discussion about the World Heritage program. CAPRA notes that the program has only four undergraduate students.

CAPRA recommends that SSHA prioritize its requests and allocate them in strategic areas where the School can grow critical mass.

Action: CAPRA will request a description of the Literature and the Spanish-language Linguistics programs.

Action: CAPRA will request some clarification from the EVC about the three management lines that are set aside (finance, marketing and strategies).

Action: CAPRA Chair will circulate comments on the SSHA plan within the committee for feedback.

C. School of Natural Sciences

Lead Reviewer: UGC Chair Amussen
Second Reviewer: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge (preliminary comments posted on crops)
Report: The SNS plan is well designed and meets the target of hires (over by one). The start-up packages are reasonable. The needs of undergraduate and graduate education are clearly addressed. CAPRA notes that the Earth System Science (ESS) has a very low enrollment and low SIRs. The major offers courses that are very similar to courses in ENVE. There seems to be a divergence between the number of faculty servicing the ESS major, the number of student credit hours and the overall number of students. CAPRA wonders if there are plans and a timetable to revise the ESS major in the future to make it more attractive to students or perhaps to benefit from classes in BIOE or BIO.

CAPRA notes that it would be useful to include some language about future development of programs, data about the distribution of grant funding in common areas and more clarification about student enrollment for LPSOEs.

Action: Comments will be circulated within the committee before being sent to the School.

CAPRA notes that it is important for all the schools to understand that 50 lines are allocated. Any request above that number will be cut. This will be conveyed to the Schools.

Next Steps:
CAPRA will send one set of feedback to the Schools listing the committee's questions and concerns. Feedback due to CAPRA within two weeks, CAPRA's report to the EVC will be a combination of the Schools' feedback and any additional comments from CAPRA.

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

CAPRA reported that for the most part the Schools have observed the EVC's guidance but some Schools are asking to frontload searches or are asking for more lines than their allotted amount. It was agreed that CAPRA will prioritize the numbers of lines that will be frontloaded. The committee will send the list of recommendations to the EVC.

CAPRA requested some guidance from the EVC regarding making recommendations for positions for non-existent but potential future programs. The EVC noted that including them in the plans is acceptable as long as those lines fit logically into existing programs and add to the capacity of an existing area. The EVC also noted that during

the next three years, no majors should be added. Any strategic planning needs to be consistent with the MOU.

CAPRA noted that there are some open lines due to the departure of some faculty. The EVC recommended that CAPRA review the plans as they are and let the deans handle the positions that have been vacated.

In regards to the cross-listed positions, CAPRA cannot admit them under the strategic plans but CAPRA can make recommendations about them.

CAPRA will rank the LPSOEs with the "regular" faculty lines. CAPRA will prioritize the requests based on the EVC allocations.

The EVC reported that with 17 hires, the campus's accumulated debt will be between $30-40 millions in 2014-15. The budget office is working on some modeling/projections with 25 lines in year 1 and 25 in year 2 and 0 in year 3.

MOU with UCOP - The EVC noted that the UCM Administration is making progress and is now in the process of laying out various quantitative pieces that will hopefully shed some clarity on the budget.

Space (for the three schools) - CAPRA recommends that space availability and location be considered while planning for searches.

VI. Proposal for a Psychological Sciences Graduate Program
Reviewers: CAPRA Chair Colvin and UGC Chair Amussen
Action: Members will send their vote via email to Analyst Paul by Monday, May 5, 2010. Chair Colvin will inform the psychological Sciences Graduate Program.

VII. Request from SACA (Senate Administration Council on Assessment)
Members are asked to review SACA memo regarding the Assessment of Administrative Units and provide comments to Senate Director Sims by Friday, May 7, 2010.

Action: CAPRA chair will provide comments by Monday, May 10, 2010.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:50pm.

Attest:
Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, May 19, 2010

I. Meeting
Pursuant to call, CAPRA met at 3:00pm on May 19, 2010, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mike Colvin presiding.

II. Consent Calendar
Agenda approved as presented.
May 6 approved pending minor correction.

III. Review of Schools Strategic Plans
On May 12 CAPRA sent preliminary comments to the Deans of the three Schools. CAPRA is in receipt of the Deans' responses to the committee's questions and comments. Today's main business is to draft a report to the EVC in which CAPRA will lay out its recommendations for faculty hires for the next year – or the next two to three years if the plans are reasonable. In its report, CAPRA will also list its concerns across the three Schools and recommendations to improve the process.

A. School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
Reviewers: CAPRA Chair Colvin and Senate Chair Conklin
In its May 12 memo to SSHA, CAPRA raised a few concerns about the SSHA academic plan:
-SSHA requested more lines than allocated by the EVC.
-Role of planning for growth for World Heritage especially around the first year.

CAPRA Comments:
- The SSHA Dean and the SSHA Executive Committee agreed on the requested 11 ftes for year one. CAPRA notes that if the EVC allocates only seven ftes for year one, the subsequent four would have to be slotted for the second year.
- In his memo to CAPRA, the SSHA Dean indicated that "25% of the students on the SIRs database are undeclared, and historically, **68%** of them end up as SSHA majors" – CAPRA welcomes some clarification about the source of this data.
-Rationale for the World Heritage and the Spanish Linguistics fte requests: CAPRA is concerned about approving requests for non-existing programs or requests that do not contribute to existing programs and to the teaching workload. CAPRA notes that this was also conveyed by the EVC.
-Spanish Linguistics – The justification provided by SSHA seems reasonable. There is a fair amount of demand for Spanish instruction and the request fits into an existing program.

- Management – CAPRA had requested some clarification about the finance, marketing and strategy positions which are essential to the management program. The response provided by SSHA is still not clear. CAPRA will request more clarification.
- Psychology is a large, fast-growing program. CAPRA strongly invites SSHA to convert one of its requests to an LPSOE (such as was done in SNS). CAPRA notes that LPSOEs can teach upper division courses and this would help support both undergraduate and graduate programs.

CAPRA Recommendation: CAPRA does not endorse the SSHA request for 11 ftes in year one; however CAPRA recommends approval of six of the seven requests

Action: CAPRA Chair Colvin will synthesize the above comments into CAPRA's report to the EVC.
CAPRA Chair will add some language in the preamble about the need for graduate groups to go forward to CCGA.
In its report, CAPRA will encourage SSHA to revisit their requests in year two and year three.

B. School of Natural Sciences

Lead Reviewer: UGC Chair Amussen
Second Reviewer: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge
In general, CAPRA's questions were answered.
-CAPRA encourages SNS to consider positions with leaner start-up packages.
-The Applied Mathematics emphasis area is currently under the IGP umbrella. When will the program move forth to CCGA? This is particularly important for WASC accreditation.
-CAPRA notes that a stand-alone graduate group in Chemistry would also help support graduate education.
-Ecology hire and ESS—On May 12 CAPRA asked about the ecology hire and future plans and timetable to revise the ESS major to make it more attractive to students. More specifically, does the current number of ESS students warrant the hiring of additional faculty for this major given the urgency of supporting campus growth during the next three years. The SNS response is still not clear. CAPRA is hopeful that this hire will be participating to the teaching workload in biology.

Action: Chair Colvin will incorporate CAPRA's comments in the committee's report.

Recommendation: CAPRA recommends approval of the SNS three-year plan with the provision that the plan be revisited by the School next year. CAPRA also recommends that two positions be front-loaded for the first year, assuming that organic chemistry will be one of those positions. CAPRA chair will make sure that the sequence presented by SNS is prioritized.

A. **School of Engineering**

Reviewers: Senate Vice Chair Evan Heit and GRC Chair Kello

-SOE initially requested 11 ftes for year one. In its response to CAPRA, the SOE Dean requested nine positions. In his December 2009 memo, the EVC allocated nine positions for SOE over the next three years.

-CAPRA notes that the initial table of ftes included a request for a junior/senior computer systems position. In the SOE response to CAPRA, the level of the position is listed as full.

Recommendation: CAPRA recommends approval of the first three positions: 1) Computer systems (jr/sr), 2) LPSOE Engineering Fundamentals and 3) Energy Storage (assistant). CAPRA also encourages the future SOE Dean to work with the engineering faculty to identify additional faculty hires.

Action: CAPRA Chair will circulate draft memo for suggestions and edits.

CAPRA will meet in person if further discussion is needed.

IV. <u>Request from SACA (Senate Administration Council on Assessment)</u>

SACA asked CAPRA to review and comment on the "Assessment of Administrative Units" document.

Action: CAPRA Chair will circulate a draft memo.

V. <u>Request from the WASC Steering Committee</u>

The WASC Steering Committee asked CAPRA to describe its role in the faculty FTE planning and allocation process. Description should include the specific types of data used, the source of each data stream and how these data are used to make decisions.

Action: CAPRA Chair will circulate a draft memo.

VI. <u>Proposal to Establish the Spatial Analysis and Research Center as a CRU</u>

Lead reviewer: CAPRA Vice Chair Rogge

Second reviewer: Senate Vice Chair Heit

Draft comments were distributed at the May 6 meeting.

Action: Senate Analyst will merge comments and send them to CAPRA chair Colvin.

The following items will be carried over to 2010-11:

A. Organized Research Units Draft Policy

CAPRA to review and make recommendations to Divco on draft ORU review policy, CAPRA will use the existing CRU policy as a model. Approved ORU policy will be distributed to the Schools and graduate groups.

B. CAPRA will draft a memo regarding the allocation and distribution of resources associated with proposals for CRUs and ORUs.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Attest:
Mike Colvin, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Fatima Paul

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 9, 2010

I. MEETING

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 10:30 a.m. on September 9, 2010 in Room 362 of the Kolligan Library, Chair Kantor presiding.

II. BYLAW 55 UNIT PROPOSALS

The following SSHA Bylaw 55 Unit proposals were distributed to the Senate standing committees:

- Cognitive and Information Sciences
- Humanities and World Culture
- Psychological Sciences
- Social Sciences and Management

ACTION: CAPRA agreed to table this for discussion at the next meeting.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

Agenda was approved as presented.

IV. REVISION OF THE CAPRA CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING THE SCHOOLS STRATEGIC PLANS

CAPRA agreed to take up the question of revising the current criteria for reviewing strategic plans from academic units. The goal is to ask schools, graduate groups, and institutes for critical information that will be useful in CAPRA's deliberations.

ACTION: Members will review the current criteria and will discuss them further at the next CAPRA meeting.

V. POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

In March 2009, President Yudof appointed a Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits (PEB). The Task Force was charged with formulating a comprehensive series of recommendations that reflected the following principles:

- Rewarding faculty and staff who serve a full career with the University;
- Providing competitive benefit programs to aid in recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty and staff; and
- Sustaining the University's commitments to its current and future retirees.

Report:
The University is looking to reduce its post-employment benefits costs, as the UCRP is currently underfunded by tens of billions of dollars. CAPRA Chair presented three possible solutions (Options A, B & C) discussed on September 8 during the UCPB meeting. Options A & B are essentially the same plans but with different rates of generosity (7.3% and 9%, respectively, in terms of employer costs), while Option C is geared toward lower-paid staff. Discussion ensued about the proposed solutions and possible variations thereof. The University must pay down unfunded liability, thereby punishing newcomers and future new faculty. One solution suggested during the meeting—tiered employee contributions based on years of service.

VI. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY

Post-Employment Benefits

- PEB task force forum will be held at UCM. No decision has yet been made because this is still contingent upon IRS approval.

Budget

- This year the campus will have to pay out $1.6-1.9 million in addition to salaries. This figure will increase over the next few years.
- The plan is to hire 50 faculty and 90 staff members, which means that the base budget will increase.
- It is important to develop an agenda for this year but it is particularly important to develop a routine-budgeting situation.
- In terms of instructional budgets, the School Deans were told to consider the budget that was allocated to their School the previous year as the base amount this year.
- The EVC is hopeful that with the MOU, there will be more clarity about budget numbers.

CAPRA expressed their concern about several budget issues. Some of those issues include the Schools' inability to make offers to graduate students due to delayed - and lack of - budget information.

CAPRA asked the EVC to provide some guidance to the Deans regarding their instructional budgets.

Consultant for Strategic Planning

CAPRA, like the Divisional Council, does not support the idea of hiring a consultant for Strategic Planning. This will be conveyed to the Administration. If resources are to be expended on outside consultants, the efforts should be to identify ways to improve resources and to improve administrative efficiencies.

FTE Allocations

- FTEs have not been allocated yet. The EVC will send an announcement to the faculty soon. The EVC is working on grouping LPSOEs into out-years and spreading them out. The Schools should be planning for 17-19 new faculty lines, including some strategic hires, for next academic year. Two of those strategic hires could possibly be done this academic year. A concern was raised that there is not enough time to do searches for next year.
- Strategic Areas – there are some themes that are more SSHA-centric than others and some that have more potential for success especially when SEII is ready for occupancy. The process has to be transparent. DivCo will discuss this at the September 13 meeting.
- How can we accommodate higher enrollment levels? CAPRA discussed issues surrounding space needs, specifically lab space, breaks between labs, etc.
- What would it take to accommodate a larger referral pool? This year there are approximately 250 students in the referral pool. Next year there could be as many as 600.

Referral Pool

This year we have about 250 students out of the referral pool (200 freshmen and about 50 transfers). Next year, there could potentially be as many as 600. CAPRA discussed what it would take to accommodate a larger referral pool.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Attest:

Shawn Kantor, Chair

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
October 7, 2010

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 10:30 a.m. on October 7, 2010 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Kantor presiding.

II. UCPB, OCTOBER 5, 2010 – *Chair Kantor*

The Senate is advocating a 2% across the board salary increase to compensate for the 2% increase in UCRP contributions. UCPB made it clear that the increase should be applied to base plus off-scale salaries, which DivCo endorsed. There will be another 5% increase in UCRP contributions, and UCPB voted to have 3% across the board, base plus off-scale, and 2% go to increase the market adjustment of the scales.

Post-Employment Benefits: The campuses are leaning towards Option C, the faculty-revised option. The integrated options are seen as too complicated and too uncertain in terms of the Social Security threshold. A comment was made that Social Security benchmarks don't have to be used to create the threshold between the levels of benefits. The integrated options provide an inexpensive University of California retirement plan for low-income employees. UCPB proposed to reject the integrated options altogether, which only a few people voted against. UCPB then voted to support Option C. CAPRA Chair abstained. The dissenting report: If staff want Option B, faculty are happy to support it. The difference between Options B and C is little to none for faculty, but noticeable for staff. There are rumors of an Option D.

Regarding the 20% employer contribution—UCM has many new employees in the system who have not benefited from the 20 year holiday in UCRP contributions, and UCM will have to pay a tremendous tax on payroll. It was suggested that the UCM Senate write a memo: 'We recognize that UCM has a relatively new employee base that has not contributed to the unfunded liability—something special should be done for this campus.' UCM could request a one size doesn't fit all plan—faculty and campus contributions could be scaled according to the length of faculty positions. UCM could also propose to have a phased increase in taxes so that UCM gets the 20% tax in 6-8 years. The VC of Student Affairs is concerned that the 20% employer contribution will raise the cost of hiring new employees in auxiliary service areas. Other campuses plan to attrite their staff and attrite their faculty in order to handle their contribution. The two recent reports from the Divisional Council at UCLA and from the Academic Council state that the UC system is significantly constrained going forward, especially since all ten campuses want to grow.

Comments from the UCM Senate standing committees on the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force Report are due to DivCo by October 22, 2010.

III. REVISIT CAPRA CRITERIA FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

The schools submitted a three-year plan last year. They are being asked to add an additional year to the plan. This will be a rolling three-year plan. Each program should have a continuous three-year forecast. The criteria could be simplified. The updated plan needs to include the following: space needs, a statement on how the programs serve graduate and undergraduate education, and research as an end in itself.

IV. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY

-Strategic Planning: CAPRA is working to synchronize its criteria with the EVC's criteria. CAPRA appreciates the simplicity of the EVC's criteria. The EVC requested comments from CAPRA on the revised criteria. He would like to show the plan to the Deans before finalizing the updated criteria.

UCM/UCD PRIME Medical Program

The following issues were discussed:

- The EVC does not support spending UCM resources on the PRIME program.
- The Academic Senate was involved early in the process, and gave its approval to *continue planning*, but the plan was implemented without further Senate consultation. The EVC stated that the reason PRIME is being pushed forward prematurely is a combination of political issues, and support from President Yudof, the Valley Coalition, and the Chancellor. It's also the next thing in the WAG report, which the Senate never saw and on which the Senate was not able to comment.
- Some UCM faculty do want to participate in the PRIME program, but UCM's interaction with UCD has not yet been defined. Five HSRI faculty members have contacted the Division Chair with complaints about the PRIME program planning, specifically commenting that there wasn't anything in writing, and that faculty were not included in the planning process. Now there is some faculty involvement in admissions, but admission into this program should go through the Senate, not ad-hoc groups of faculty. The EVC stated that admissions into the PRIME program was done through the UC Davis Medical School Senate.
- David Hosley, Associate VC of Development at UCM, showed Division Chair Heit the University's fundraising goals for this year, which included raising $30 million for the PRIME program to endow the UC Davis Medical School. The EVC stated that he had not been informed of this goal, and that the only way UCM should raise funds for the PRIME program is through the Valley Coalition, that UCM should not be directly involved in fundraising efforts. A comment was made that if the funding is raised, it needs to be able to be moved to this campus if a medical school does eventually become a reality. The EVC responded that the MOU would cement a relationship between UCM and UCD. A comment was made that the way the program is being initiated by the administration seems counter to the Standing Orders of the Regents, and that it completely abrogates the Academic Senate's role in exercising its authority over courses and curriculum. The EVC responded that

PRIME is a UC Davis program, so UC Davis faculty have the most say in the planning.

- A comment was made that the Senate and faculty from both campuses should be consulting on the issue of UCD expanding into the Valley, from a resource allocation point of view. It will be very costly to develop a medical school, approximately $400-500 million without a hospital. The state will take a very long time to fund the project, especially since UC Riverside is also developing a medical program. The EVC commented that the only way this medical school will be developed is if the surrounding counties all decide that it is crucial for their needs and agree to increase taxes to fund the project.
- CAPRA Chair Kantor mentioned that a new element at the UCPB meeting was the threat that faculty now perceive with regard to systemwide resources. For many faculty the outlook is dire. The EVC commented that most of the current issues surround Post-Employment Benefits. There was a question as to whether the administrators had seen the two recent statements submitted to the Senate by the Academic Council and the UCLA Divisional Council. The Academic Council submitted a document to the Commission on the Future regarding downsizing staff and faculty, and UCLA wrote a more detailed and subtle document concerning buildings. The statements implied that UCM would have to increase its student-to-faculty ratio.

Campus Growth

UCM has a goal of reaching a steady state of approximately 7500 students. The EVC expressed concern that the campus could not accommodate that volume of students. If UCM's future is a steady state of 7500 students and 1000 faculty and staff, and that is the future for a very long time, this might change how the resources for various programs are allocated over the next few years. Currently resources are allocated piecemeal to various programs with the understanding that every program will get its turn to be developed. The EVC feels that this is not the best way to build a university; that instead, UCM should focus its energy and resources. The problem with focusing is that a broad foundation will not be built—UCM will start to lose faculty in some programs. The EVC expressed concern that this could create more attrition than UCM could handle. This year alone, with a few retirements and a few resignations, UCM will lose a significant amount of funding—each loss costs the university a few hundred thousand dollars.

CAPRA feels that the situation is worse than it has ever been. The EVC expressed more optimism, especially regarding the three-year planning horizon, as well as the commitment from the Office of the President for another three-year plan, depending on the current budget. CAPRA Chair clarified its concern: once UCM reaches its steady state, the Office of the President may pull back and leave UCM on its own. The EVC commented that if UCM could grow to 10 000 students, it would be able to be more independent—it could pay its debts and cut down the student to faculty ratio. However, the EVC expressed concern that UCM might not be able to accommodate more than 6000 or 6500 students after the two new buildings open.

Also, without additional on-campus housing, more students will have to live off-campus, which means UCM will have to pay mitigation costs to the city and county for improving roadways.

Academic Office Building

The shape and layout of the building has not been determined. The space could be split between two smaller buildings or contained in one larger building. The building will contain teaching space, tutorial space, research space and offices. Its use and function may change over time. This will not be a temporary building. If one larger Academic Office building is chosen, it will be built behind the library, near the bus turnaround. This raises some issues about the noise and fumes from the buses, which will be enclosed by buildings on three sides.

State Budget

UCM may not receive as much funding for its unfunded student numbers. The EVC spoke to UC Provost Pitts about this issue. Provost Pitts said that UC's intention, if the state budget did include $51 million for UC, was to make UCM whole in terms of its base funding. The EVC was unsure if 'whole' referred to the 4000 students UCM planned to admit this year, or the 4300 enrolled students. UCM exceeded its projected enrollment because it admitted students from the referral pool, and because its retention rate increased from previous years. Last year UCM accepted a large number of students from the transfer referral pool, and a larger number than usual from the normal freshman referral pool. If UCM can't accept as many general applicants, they will go into the referral pool and UCM will accept them from the referral pool as space allows.

As a result of that meeting, there were two positive things: UC will come up with the extra funding for Social Sciences and Management. They also agreed that it would be poor planning to put a $3 million addition on to the recreation center, which is all that UCM's debt service would allow if the campus was capped at 5200 students in two years. UC is instead willing to back UCM to go forward with a $10 million addition to the recreation center.

IV. EVC FTEs ALLOCATIONS

There was a suggestion to include a constraint that some FTE allocations should be at the senior level. The EVC commented that junior faculty do not seem to have the same success rates as senior faculty in some areas, and that they tend to leave sooner, for a variety of reasons, which forces UCM to continually invest in hiring new faculty. UCM has done more of that in the last four years, especially in the sciences and engineering. It was noted that there is no policy on what happens to faculty lines after people leave. At other campuses, if someone leaves because they don't get tenure, the unit will retain the position automatically. However, units need to have appropriate standards for hiring faculty. The EVC commented that given the fact that UCM will continue to grow the size of its faculty body, every time a faculty member leaves, there is an additional start-up cost. If those positions are left in the school, the responsibility for the new start-up cost should fall on the schools. A comment was made that, given how stressed all the programs are, schools covering start-up is nearly impossible. If UCM had a sustainable faculty ratio, holding a position open would not be difficult.

V. BYLAW 55 UNIT PROPOSALS

These proposals simply codify what is de-facto in SSHA. The only associated resource implication would be if the four units were able to become departments, in which case there would be a need for additional staff. For the foreseeable future, the units will have pooled resources at the school level with modest faculty support. A comment was made that CAPRA should not be focusing on this issue when it is more relevant to other committees.

ACTION: CAPRA will draft a one-line memo: the committee sees no resource implications; therefore CAPRA chooses not to opine.

VI. PROPOSED 2011-2013 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Comments were made that this issue is not within CAPRA's purview. CAPRA Chair Kantor commented that the calendar seems to include the same number of instructional days, and the resource implications are constant over time. UGC is concerned that some class schedules will be impacted more than others—the hit on Thursday classes has been especially bad this year. CAPRA will not opine on this issue.

The following items were tabled for discussion at the next meeting:

- **Organized Research Units Draft Policy**
- **Systemwide Review Items:**
  Report of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force
  Academic Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Attest:

Chair Shawn Kantor

Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
October 21, 2010

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 10:30 a.m. on October 21, 2010 in Room 362 of the Kolligan Library, Chair Kantor presiding.

II. Consent Calendar

The Agenda and the Minutes from October 7 were approved pending the following revision: Item II of the Minutes includes the phrase, "which DivCo endorsed." This should be replaced by "which the Academic Council endorsed."

III. REVISIT CAPRA CRITERIA FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

CAPRA reviewed the EVC's draft criteria and had several comments: The EVC's criteria emphasize the need for research opportunities. CAPRA agreed that the development of areas of research 'vital to our future' would be beneficial and possible given UCM's current financial situation, whereas the development of new programs of instruction would be too costly at this point. The memo also emphasizes the need to support existing undergraduate and graduate programs that will allow for the development of new programs in the future. This point was unclear. CAPRA asked the EVC to clarify his memo. The EVC responded that the memo's emphasis on new programs of instruction originated in another document and is no longer relevant.

The following comments were made regarding the CAPRA draft criteria:
The document is too long. A proposal was made to return to the guiding criteria and discard the changes made in the previous academic year. Another proposal was made to return to the justifications for prioritization. A question was raised whether there are any criteria regarding replacing retired and resigned faculty. The EVC's memo states that the number of new lines depends to some extent on the number of retirements and resignations that need to be backfilled. The UGC Chair mentioned that the EVC suggested that in order to replace a retiring faculty member, SSHA should save funding this year to pay the new start-up costs next year. Several CAPRA members wondered what happens when faculty don't get tenure. It would be possible to create the wrong incentives: if units must wait years to replace faculty members, it could encourage them to lower the bar. The criteria ask individual units to think about campus-wide strategies, and ask for estimated resource requests for program review and ongoing assessments. However, faculty are not hired to do assessment. These points can be removed from the criteria. CAPRA members agreed that the criteria should address cross-school or interdisciplinary programs, but should not address new undergraduate degree programs. Existing programs may be refined in the coming year, but new programs will not be developed.

Several changes made to the criteria for the 2009-2010 Academic Year will be retained, but most are no longer relevant. It was proposed that CAPRA request that the schools include a brief overview that explains how their plan is shaped by work load, space needs, future new programs, etc.

In an effort to make the criteria as concise as possible, the CAPRA document will only include criteria not already included in the EVC's document.

ACTION: CAPRA Chair Kantor will revise the CAPRA criteria to include the above changes, and will send it to CAPRA members for review. CAPRA Chair will also revise the EVC's criteria and will send it to CAPRA members as well.

IV. CONSULTATION WITH EVC/PROVOST ALLEY

CAPRA Chair Kantor asked how the EVC's Criteria for Strategic Planning will address the issue of faculty leaving their positions. The EVC did not want to give a definite answer, but mentioned that this year, when faculty left, the lines were automatically kept within the school. There may be a time when positions must be held open to save resources for start-up. Currently, the issue may not be worth including in this strategic plan. The EVC stated that there is no worry of re-provisioning positions at this point. No program has the necessary depth to justify moving positions between programs. When schools submit their strategic plans, how should they address positions they know or suspect they will lose? The EVC recommended that schools request the position again. The replacement position does not necessarily need to be ranked like a new position.

The EVC also discussed the meeting of former UC Chancellors Park and Young with the Cabinet. Park and Young stressed that some planning must be left for the new Chancellor. The EVC responded that the new Chancellor needs to focus on implementing Phase II of the campus, especially finding the resources to expand the campus. Park and Young agreed. Park and Young are focusing on the issues that the new Chancellor will face surrounding the development of the physical footprint. The DivCo Chair asked if Park and Young's plan would involve exclusively physical space. The EVC did not know. He mentioned that Park and Young discussed the need for graduate education and the space to do it, the space for research, etc. The DivCo Chair stated that it would be better for Park and Young to focus on the key issues. The EVC predicted that the campus will be significantly space-impeded in the next few years if the physical planning of the campus is not given priority. CAPRA Chair mentioned that there will have to be another state-wide decision to invest in UCM, in order to cover the infrastructure costs of Phase II development. The EVC responded that there will have to be another G.O. bond for higher education. The earliest the bond would pass is 2012. If UCM got a full UC campus' share of state funding, it would have enough money to build the state-funded parts of Phase II.

Regarding the planned Classroom and Office Building, the Office of the President has been pushing for the two-building model. Implementing the current design would require moving the existing trailers to another location, the cost of which would be approximately $1.5 million.

Regarding next year's budget, CAPRA Chair mentioned that units cannot effectively talk about their budgets until they know what they had for their previous budgets. The EVC responded that last year's base budget is supposedly in place again this year. The only thing not in place is additions to the budget. The Budget Committee is working to establish the complete budget.

X. REPORT OF THE POST-EMPLOYEMENT BENEFITS TASK FORCE

UCPB and Faculty Welfare have rejected Option A, and seem to prefer C over B. They have stated that for people who stay in the previous UCRP, their contribution will be no more than 7%. Faculty salaries have to be increased to compensate for increased contribution. CAPRA Chair asked if CAPRA should comment on the PEB Report. CAPRA could say, for instance, that UCM is being taxed from a generational point of view. It has a junior faculty with short years of service, but the employer is being taxed as if it had a faculty with a 20-year service record. The UGC Chair mentioned that UGC is recommending that UCM get a subsidy, either a straight cash subsidy or a lower percentage of employer contribution, on the grounds that other campuses used the holiday to their benefit in ways that UCM hasn't been able to. Also, paying the standard UCRP contribution will nullify the subsidies that UCM is currently receiving.

DivCo Chair Heit expressed an interest in showing sensitivity in the Division's comments. UCM should show solidarity with the other campuses. Even the wording of the comments is important. The comments should not say that UCM has been subsidized up until now. It is important to mention the issue of the other campuses getting the holiday and being able to build their infrastructure. Also, even if UCM contributes the whole amount, it would mean nothing to the system and a lot to the campus. Finally, it would be useful to support some version of the UCFW recommendations. Every other division he has heard from is going to support something along those lines. CAPRA Chair suggested that CAPRA may not need to submit its own comments, since it is in full agreement with DivCo's sentiments. The UGC Chair commented that it would be beneficial to mention all the committees who are in agreement with DivCo's comments. The DivCo Chair agreed, and commented that it may not be necessary to attach the committees' memos. The DivCo Chair asked for CAPRA's written comments, which he will use to prepare DivCo's response. The Division's comments may not sway the Task Force, but at least they will be acknowledged and recorded.

VII. ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS DRAFT POLICY

This will be discussed at the November 4 CAPRA meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Attest:

Chair Shawn Kantor

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE – MERCED DIVISION**

CAPRA
Thursday, November 4, 2010
10:30-12:00
ROOM 232KL

MINUTES

I. Chair's Report – *Professor Shawn Kantor*

- **UCPB, November 2, 2010**

The CAPRA Chair discussed the role of the Interim Vice Chancellor for University Relations, and mentioned that University Relations is moving in a positive direction.

II. Consent Calendar

The Agenda and the October 21 Meeting Minutes were approved.

III. Administrative Guest – David Hosley, Interim VC for University Relations

David Hosley discussed the following steps University Relations is taking to increase funding:
-UR has tried to set and achieve more realistic goals. UR is currently 22% ahead of its fundraising goal. This is largely being driven by success with fellowships and scholarships.
-It is important to find faculty who are interested in fundraising, and are doing appealing scholarly research, and faculty who are capable of representing the University in public. Hosley expressed interest in involving faculty in legislative education, especially when the goals of the faculty align with the goals of the University. Since the recent election, UR has been communicating with newly or re-elected legislators to familiarize them with the goals of the University, and plans to bring elected officials to campus. UCM recently hosted the League of Cities meeting, during which the Chancellor was able to speak to over 40 local elected officials about the campus.
-UR has chosen to focus on five markets within California that are critical to UCM's long-term success, due to their financial or political influence. UR has categorized the student population by county and by legislative districts. These numbers are used during communications with district representatives. UR will also concentrate on the Hispanic market, because the Valley population will continue to grow in that area.
-Deans must be encouraged to develop better funding priorities. UCM needs high quality proposals to be competitive. Many recent proposals have been above the price range of available donor contributions. The CAPRA Chair mentioned that many faculty are willing to be involved in fundraising, especially in their particular areas. Hosley responded that faculty can be involved by advocating their research interests, drafting proposals, preparing budgets, and gathering information. It would be useful for faculty to take proposals beyond the brainstorming stage, and to develop them into working documents.

- The CAPRA Chair mentioned that there should be a line of communication between UR, the Deans, and the faculty, but faculty are often not included. Hosley responded that the Deans are ultimately responsible for developing funding priorities within their schools.
- UCM should be appealing to larger corporations for donations. Appeals have been made in the past, but without specificity. UCM needs to ask for project-based funding.
- The GRC Chair asked whether Hosley's perspective is represented on the Chancellor's search committee. Hosley responded that he was able to represent his perspective when the cabinet addressed the search committee. Generally, his perspective is under-represented. He expressed that the Chancellor must develop strong relationships with elected officials from outside the Merced region, must be a proven fundraiser, and must have a track record of being able to secure diverse faculty and staff.
-The Chairman of the Board of Trustees sits on the search committee. The members of the Board of Trustees have been asked to commit to addressing fundraising needs on campus more directly. The commitments of the Board will be matched to the University's 3-year plan. Hosley commented that the Board will most likely become a fundraising body. The criteria for Board members will change to address the need for stronger fundraising capabilities.
- The UGC Chair asked whether UR planned to address the low proportion of Caucasian students to minority students, especially in comparison to the ratio of Caucasians to minorities in the state. Hosley responded that higher Caucasian enrollment levels would not be representative of the overall state population for much longer, and that the issue of race is not as important as the issue of quality education.
- Hosley suggested meeting quarterly with the Senate to discuss shared goals.

IV. CAPRA Criteria for Strategic Planning and EVC's Criteria

The CAPRA Chair distributed CAPRA's revised criteria. CAPRA discussed the nature of faculty endorsements of Academic Plans within schools. The CAPRA Chair expressed interest in avoiding making prescriptive statements about the voting process; as long as faculty are involved, the schools should be able to make their own decisions. It was agreed that the criteria would be revised so that Academic Plans must describe the voting process within schools. A question was asked regarding the process to replace retired or resigned FTEs. It was agreed that replacement FTEs should not be part of strategic planning. The UGC Chair suggested including a sentence such as, "Replacement positions due to resignations or retirement should be listed separately from the strategic appointments, but schools should include a justification for their use." The UGC Chair commented that the EVC's memo lists the due date for Academic Plans as January 14th, 2011. February 1, 2011 was suggested as a more reasonable date. The EVC will be asked to revise his memo to include the suggested due date.

V. GRC Draft Strategic FTEs Solicitation

The DivCo Chair asked CAPRA to opine on GRC's memo. The CAPRA Chair commented that it might be more helpful if groups were allowed to endorse only one proposal, because under the current solicitation, the number of proposals may be overwhelming. The GRC Chair responded that it is helpful to know if there is more than one group supporting a proposal. Also, he mentioned that there may be proposed positions that could belong in multiple groups, which

may not be decided at the proposal stage. Thus, it is important for at least two groups to be able to put forth a proposal. There should still be a primary supporting group, because one group should be willing to take responsibility for the proposal. The DivCo Chair reminded CAPRA that the five positions will not be hired in the same year, so there will be some time to revise the process if necessary. The DivCo Chair also commented on the proposal review process. The EVC suggested that there should be an external person on each review panel. Also, this would be the first review process not involving CAPRA. The DivCo Chair suggested that CAPRA could have the opportunity to opine on nominations. The CAPRA Chair commented that if CAPRA is not included in the initial decision-making, it may encounter problems later when it is charged with funding the new strategic hire. The GRC Chair responded that the solicitation specifically prohibits proposals for new programs, which may reduce some of CAPRA's burden to fund new hires. He also commented that CAPRA should be able to opine on any recommendations from the review panel, but the final decision will rest with the administration. The DivCo Chair also commented that the requirement of a confidential letter from a Dean was unclear. The GRC Chair responded that there was concern that the Deans will have to see a number of proposals and that there may be a conflict of interest involved. He suggested the solicitation be revised to require a letter from a Dean, but "confidential" be omitted. The CAPRA Chair asked how the review panel would be comprised, as internal reviewers may have a vested interest in a specific proposal. The GRC Chair responded that the external reviewers will be crucial to the panel, and that it will be possible to find reviewers from within the area who do not have a vested interest. The CAPRA Chair expressed a lack of trust in CoC to choose review panels appropriately. The UGC Chair commented that the alternative would be for DivCo to appoint reviewers from the body of faculty currently serving on Senate committees. The DivCo Chair shared the CAPRA Chair's concerns, but stated that DivCo cannot practically make all panel appointments. The new Bylaw 55 Units may go into effect in January 2011, in which case CoC will have more responsibility. The DivCo Chair plans to increase DivCo's consulting role in CoC decisions. Regarding nominations to the review panel, CoC could consult GRC or CAPRA directly.

ACTION: The GRC and CAPRA Chairs will send their recommendations to the DivCo Chair.

The following item was not discussed:
Organized Research Units Draft Policy

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm.

Attest:

Chair Shawn Kantor