



320 STEPHENS HALL  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

May 18, 2020

PROFESSOR OLIVER O'REILLY  
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

*Re: CAPRA 2020-21 Budget and Policy Recommendations*

The mission of the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) is to advise the Chancellor and inform the campus on issues related to finance, space management, and academic planning. UC Berkeley is currently weathering the global COVID-19 pandemic crisis, which has brought unprecedented public health and financial challenges to campus. One silver lining to this catastrophe has been the emergence of strong, inclusive, and dynamic partnership between campus leadership and administration and Academic Senate leadership and committees. We thank the Chancellor and her team for moving as quickly as possible in a time of tremendous pressure and uncertainty. CAPRA has been very impressed with how well our leadership has communicated the values we cherish and worked to create policy that is consistent with them as they react to the crisis in real time. It is in this spirit that we offer our budget and policy recommendations for 2020-2021, and hope that we can provide useful direction to the administration and information to our colleagues across the campus.

The committee asks that DIVCO endorse these recommendations and forward them, along with DIVCO's endorsement, to Chancellor Christ and EVCP Alivisatos. We also request that Chancellor Christ provide a written response to the Senate no later than September 15th, 2020, detailing the extent to which our recommendations will be adopted. Lastly, we ask DIVCO to send a copy of this report to all members of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate.

**Summary of Recommendations:**

On the basis of our work this year, we encourage the administration and the Senate to collaborate in order to address:

1. **Finance Reform and Financial Planning.** The administration and finance reform working group offered a way out of the opaque budget process of the past, the first part of which was the formulation of the 2019-2020 finance reform proposal. CAPRA is in agreement that while the plan was well-intended, it currently relies too heavily on student credit hours and awarded degrees, and does not include any impact analysis on the ability to deliver our academic mission. Our concern is the demoralizing effect the proposed

plan has had on faculty and staff. We suggest that the finance reform plan be put aside for now and propose to work together with the administration to **build a new, collaborative, inclusive process of financial planning** that will meet the enormous challenges of the COVID-19 crisis and beyond.

2. **Administrative Unit Review.** A comprehensive and regularly scheduled review of administrative units will increase performance of those units and build trust between faculty and staff. It will give faculty and the administration a big picture view of the functioning of the university that will help future strategic planning. It will also provide a way for voices to be heard during a time of crisis, as we provide a new mechanism for understanding the COVID-19 crisis' impact on administrative units across campus, and for informing faculty of the segments of campus that allow us to carry out our academic mission.
3. **Academic Program Review.** We will also continue to modify CAPRA's participation in academic program reviews by reducing the effort CAPRA spends on evaluating departments at the same time we increase our effort to evaluate the context in which they fulfill their academic mission (disciplines or decanal units). We will also include instructional resilience more explicitly in our considerations.
4. **Government Relations:** We will work closely with campus to develop a more robust strategy to engage with the State Legislature and Governor to increase state funding of UC. We applaud the fact that the Academic Senate has formed a new group called Senate Faculty Relations, composed of Senate members and staff from the Offices of Government Relations and University Development (UDAR). This group could help us effectively coordinate with other UC campuses to advocate for state funding to help solve the dire financial crisis brought on by the global pandemic. In addition to philanthropy and raising tuition, we can engage with California's government to ask for educational and infrastructure investments; these will pay huge dividends in our citizens' future and help maintain California's position as the 5<sup>th</sup> largest economy in the world.

## **Background**

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation is charged by the Academic Senate with the following duties: CAPRA...

1. Confers with and advises the Chancellor on policy regarding academic and physical planning, budget, and resource allocation, both annual and long range.
2. Initiates studies in planning and budget matters, and if necessary to accomplish the study, authorizes establishment of ad hoc committees.
3. Maintains liaison with other committees of the Division on matters relating to budget and planning.
4. Reports regularly to the Divisional Council and to the Division.

Together, these duties are the means through which CAPRA pursues its mission of ensuring that the UC Berkeley community collectively shepherds our resources—money, space, and time—as effectively as possible in order to advance research, teaching, and service. CAPRA seeks to think about the campus holistically and systematically, for example, by attending to interrelationships between academic and space planning or considering the downstream effects of budgetary changes on departmental outcomes.

The global pandemic completely transformed an already complex year for our campus and quickly shifted the focus from other issues such as new processes for capital projects, strenuous disagreements between the administration and the faculty on finance reform, strikes by graduate students, and stalled contract negotiations between UCOP and lecturers and service workers, among other challenges.

## **Updates on Recommendations from Last Year**

For FY 2019-2020, CAPRA made three major recommendations:

1. Capital Planning
2. Finance Reform
3. Administrative Review

The first of these has been fully embraced by the administration in their new process to review capital projects, which CAPRA supports and greatly appreciates. With consultation from CAPRA, EVCP Paul Alivisatos and Associate Vice Chancellor-Capital Strategies John Arvin created a new structure by which each capital project would be subjected to thorough academic, financial, and design review that includes members of the Academic Senate and removes individuals with conflicts of interest from decision-making. As a first test of this new process, the Upper Hearst Project, which generated so much controversy in Spring 2019, was subjected to a new financial review, which was released to the Senate in Spring 2020 and which made it clear that the project would cost campus \$20M more than estimated. Although the COVID-19 crisis resulted in a public announcement by the administration to suspend all capital projects, CAPRA is convinced that the current vision for the Upper Hearst project is not viable at any time in the future.

We note that COVID-19 has given us new opportunities to consider building maintenance projects. If large numbers of our buildings will be all or partially empty for long periods of time, some deferred maintenance that would normally be disruptive may now be possible. Smaller capital projects may also be possible, such as minor renovations to more fully allow laboratory and field research with appropriate social distancing, making it safer for people to do work that is impossible from home.

The other two recommendations from last year are also featured in this year's recommendations, as we have substantially modified our proposals in line with new information.

## **CAPRA Recommendations for 2020-2021**

This year we are making four recommendations:

### **1. Finance Reform**

CAPRA has advocated for systemic finance reform for many years, convinced that that greater transparency and predictability of budgets would allow academic units to make better decisions and to operate more efficiently. However, CAPRA did not have adequate opportunity to evaluate or provide input to the Academic Finance Reform model that has since been presented to us as

final. The outcome of the adopted methodology would require deep cuts to certain units in order to increase funding for others and may threaten the comprehensive excellence of Berkeley's academic mission. CAPRA does not believe that Academic Finance Reform should stand in for thoughtful, consultative academic planning. Some specific concerns include:

Although it is clear that some units urgently need more resources to meet their growing demand for undergraduate courses, a one-size-fits-all approach will not be appropriate for all units across campus. CAPRA is not convinced that the set of metrics and weights chosen are the right ones, and we would like an opportunity to explore the data and evaluate potential impacts.

CAPRA is concerned by the set of constraints around the so-called "allocable pool." Given the great uncertainties facing us now, we must acknowledge that the allocability of resources depends on the actual existence of resources, which will no doubt be diminished. But how they should be allocated between the administrative and academic units remains an important and open question.

Therefore, we recommend that the EVCP place the implementation of academic finance reform on hold until such time as we can complete a meaningful impact assessment within the context of the financial response to the global pandemic. We propose a joint working group to continue this work, which would include a subgroup of CAPRA members. Now more than ever, the Academic Senate and the administration should work together as a team to make difficult decisions and prioritize investments that will sustain our academic mission.

## **2. Administrative Review**

Last year, CAPRA submitted a detailed proposal outlining how administrative review could proceed. We thought such review was justified and would lead to better administration on campus. In our recommendations we wrote:

*"UC Berkeley is internationally renowned for the quality of our research. This sustained excellence has a variety of sources, including our processes of review—at the individual level through the merit review system, and at the level of the department or school through Academic Program Review. UC Berkeley is, by contrast, not internationally renowned for the effectiveness or efficiency of its administration. CAPRA has repeatedly called for greater individual-level accountability of senior administrators (parallel to BIR review), and here we call for the parallel to academic program review: administrative program review. Comprehensive and collaborative reviews can advance how a unit understands its mission and how effectively it works to achieve that mission. Conducted on a regular schedule—to start, we propose every unit get reviewed every ten years—program reviews can serve as a map for systematic improvement.*

*"Administrative program review will result in greater and more standardized data availability and transparency and can thus serve an important function in the governance of common goods funding. Efficient allocation decisions require a systematic view of what is happening across the different units and how those units relate. Through administrative program review, this systematic view will emerge over time, allowing for better decision-making and greater confidence."*

We went on to propose a process based on academic program reviews that included a self-study, an outside review including external reviewers, and a written report to which the unit would then respond (included as Appendix B with our 2019-2020 budget and policy recommendations). The Chancellor responded in writing and in person during a CAPRA meeting on October 16, 2019. Although she agreed in principle with our proposal, she was concerned both about the amount of work it would entail and also the impact on staff morale in regards to new faculty oversight.

In considering the Chancellor's objections, we have modified our proposal, based on our 2019 experience undertaking an informal review of Facilities Services (FS). In fact, CAPRA's experience in conducting the review of FS was actually quite different from the model of the APR. It involved the whole committee—not just one or two CAPRA representatives—visiting the FS offices and shops and meeting the FS team. The site visit culminated in a presentation—given by the unit's leadership, but which was delivered in the presence of many of the assembled FS employees—of the results of the recent self-study and external review, and a description of the current challenges that the unit is facing. The question-and-answer session that followed, in which a number of the staff participated, was extremely informative, and it revealed the extent to which even long-serving and quite senior members of faculty remain unaware of how individual campus buildings, and the campus as a whole, are actually maintained. The exchange between CAPRA and the FS staff members was both candid and respectful, and during the meeting the FS staff seemed pleased to be able to explain the difficult situation they are currently facing, and the trade-offs they are forced to make, to representatives of the faculty.

The review of FS was followed up with a second meeting in December 2019, where Marc Fisher, Vice Chancellor-Administration and Sally McGarrahan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Services, attended a meeting of CAPRA in order to provide a further briefing. We have concluded based on the FS model that there is a huge gulf in understanding that separates those working as part of the university's academic mission from those working in units to support that mission. CAPRA members afterwards reflected that the question of "resource allocation" is explicitly part of CAPRA's brief; however, since the committee has been, up to now, entirely unaware of the challenges FS is facing, we have only ever been able to participate in the discussion of resource allocation *to the academic mission*. This seems a serious limitation in the committee's overall perspective; and one that could only be remedied by *a sustained engagement with administrative units* such as FS, as is currently being advocated in our proposal to hold administrative reviews. If we take the experience of this first administrative review as a model, instead of the APR, our proposal starts to look rather different – and we therefore make the following recommendations:

- (1) We propose to provide both an *advisory* report to the unit and an *informational* report, addressed to the faculty at large and made generally available. While the advisory report would comment on strengths and shortcomings within the unit and make recommendations, the informational report would help the unit by communicating about it to faculty and giving its staff a voice, addressing the Chancellor's concern regarding the stress of such a review on unit staff. Faculty should be made aware of all the hard work that is being done all over campus—in very difficult circumstances—to keep the university, its buildings, and its physical plant in operation. A series of such informational reports produced by CAPRA, assembled over time, could serve as a

coherent description of the nuts-and-bolts of the university administrative operation and how it functions. The collected executive summaries *alone* could provide a kind of big-picture primer for interested faculty as to the operation and interaction of the various administrative units on campus.

- (2) We therefore propose to proceed with this model of administrative review in 2020-2021. This would include sending the administrative unit selected for review the self-study questions early in the fall semester. After receiving responses, CAPRA would schedule a site visit (late in the fall semester or early in the spring semester) and spend a CAPRA meeting visiting the unit. After our visit, we would schedule one more follow-up meeting and then produce our reports by the end of the spring semester.

### **3. Modified Academic Program Review**

CAPRA continues to believe that it will be advantageous to the campus to develop a process through which to evaluate scholarship and teaching at other scales besides departments, whether that is decanal units or cross-disciplinary groupings of faculty around themes. Given the scale and complexity of our campus, many of our important intellectual projects do not correspond to departments, but are larger and more diffuse; therefore, we need ways of conducting academic planning beyond and across departments. Reviewing departments one-by-one makes it difficult to see broader, more systemic problems, such as the historical legacy of which disciplines have departmental status. For example, there are no Asian languages named as departments while many European languages have their own departments. As discussed during a number of academic program reviews this year, reviewing departments in isolation doesn't seem as useful as it would be if departments could be reviewed in a broader way, perhaps by decanal units or by grouping similar fields together.

- (1) We propose that the CAPRA representative for each academic program review explore ways to incorporate this broader analysis into their report. This will require additional planning in CAPRA in 2020-2021.
- (2) Clearly, "instructional resilience" is the new normal. There should be additional planning for and evaluation of how we are managing instructional resilience, and this is consistent with the cross-cutting theme of the academic review process we are proposing.

### **4. New Strategies to Increase State Funding**

The COVID-19 crisis will create a large budget problem for UC, and the university needs to find ways to more successfully communicate the need and the value of state financial support. This is a complex issue with many factors, including UC's research capabilities and its ability to help with the crisis, its position as one of the largest employers in the state, and how it handles the balance of in-state, out-of-state, and international students. Currently, our budget's largest revenue sources are tuition, philanthropy, research, and state support. Due to the new financial crisis from the global pandemic, we will lose at least \$200M – and it is clear that this budget hole will not be partially filled by raising tuition (as the Regents have tabled the new proposal for raising “cohort” tuition). Philanthropy alone is unlikely to be a solution. Although our capital campaign is very impressive, raising \$6B for the campus is over nine years, the annual amount of giving is far short of what we would need to cover our short-term losses. Moreover, only a very small percentage of the donations are unrestricted funds. So, even with this fiscal year's record \$800M of donations, less than \$50M are unrestricted funds. By contrast, the state gives UC

Berkeley more than \$350M annually in unrestricted funds. With this brief financial summary, we make the following recommendation:

Although faculty and administrators characterize the declining investment of the state as inevitable, we need to see COVID-19 as an opportunity to change that dynamic. We should marshal our arguments to make the case to the state that we must seize this opportunity to invest in research, education, and infrastructure to rebuild our economy for the next generation. For that reason, we must develop a more robust strategy to engage with the State Legislature and Governor to increase state funding of UC. The Academic Senate has formed a new group called Senate Faculty Relations, composed of Academic Senate members and staff from the Offices of Government Relations and University Development (UDAR). This group could coordinate with other UC campuses to advocate for state funding to help solve the dire financial crisis brought on by the global pandemic.

Changes to finance reform, instituting an administrative program review process, modifying academic program review, and investing in a new strategy to advocate for additional state support will all contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of resource allocation in support of high-quality academic planning. As ever, CAPRA stands ready to work with DIVCO and the administration in these efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Paul Fine', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Paul Fine, Chair  
Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation