

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION
(CAPRA)**

Wednesday, October 8, 2014

9:00 – 10:00 am

KL 362

I. Guest – Provost/EVC Peterson 9:00 – 10:00 am

Discussion: 1. Strategic Academic Focusing. What is the deliverable at the end of the process? Will CAPRA have any input into the process, and if so, when? How will the allocation process for new FTEs for next year be done in light of Strategic Focusing? 2. Space. Is there any contingency plan for future space if Project 2020 falls through, i.e. no external partners are found who are willing to build academic space, particularly lab space, at an acceptable cost? In the shorter term, are there any underlying principles that go into determining who gets space on campus and how much?

*****The remaining agenda items will be discussed via email.*****

II. Chair's Report – Anne Kelley

Updates from October 7 UCPB meeting.

III. Consent Calendar

Pg. 1-3

Action requested: Approval of minutes from September 24 meeting.

IV. Campus Space Planning and Prioritization

Pg. 4

Action requested: CAPRA members to develop principles of space planning and prioritization based on a committee member's prior communication to senior administrative leadership. The principles are intended for distribution to the Provost/EVC.

V. Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
September 24, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on September 24, 2014 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

- I. Guests - Strategic Academic Focusing Committee members
Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF) committee members Jeff Gilger and Arnold Kim provided the following updates to CAPRA:
 - the proposals are currently in the second round of review. The SAF committee did not meet over the summer but the Provost/EVC and leadership communicated about the proposals. September 19 was the first SAF meeting of the fall semester.
 - one of the major criteria used to evaluate the proposals was whether the proposals were interdisciplinary.
 - Provost/EVC has been collecting data to help inform future decisions and to frame the ranking and evaluating of proposals. The data were drawn from various university resources. Several indices and benchmarks will eventually be used to evaluate the proposals with advice from faculty.
 - at today's all-faculty forum, the Provost/EVC will announce the five overarching research themes to which the proposals will align. He will ask for feedback from the faculty on these five themes and seek input on which proposals align with these themes.
 - the ratio of disciplinary hiring to "thematic" hires is unknown. It is also unclear at this point how multiple units that would fall under one research theme will be allocated FTE lines. The SAF committee understands that these negotiations ideally take place before faculty lines are established.
 - the proposals will be submitted to external reviewers after the Provost/EVC elicits more feedback on the five research themes.
 - the Provost/EVC is interested in multi-year planning rather than year-to-year requests of FTE lines. He also prefers longer-range planning than enumerating projected student enrollment to number of faculty positions desired. While CAPRA members agreed that this would be more efficient

and reduce faculty workload, it is unknown if some FTE allocation process will be agreed on in a timely fashion this year to allocate faculty lines next year. External reviewing of proposals is a lengthy process.

--SAF committee and the Provost/EVC aim to finish the SAF process by the end of this semester.

--additional feedback regarding space and equipment will be elicited from faculty.

--achieving consensus on the thematic research titles will be a major accomplishment for the SAF committee.

--the Provost/EVC might welcome CAPRA's advice on how to reconcile discipline-based hiring of faculty and hiring into the thematic research areas.

--one of the goals of identifying thematic research areas is to establish UCM's reputation in these particular areas. The underlying goal of the SAF committee is to assist the Provost/EVC establish the framework to achieve this.

Gilger and Kim agreed to present the following questions to the Provost/EVC from CAPRA: 1) what is the deliverable from this strategic academic focusing process and what is the deliverable's rationale? 2) what is the role of the Academic Senate in this new process and what is the expectation for CAPRA's involvement?

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The September 10 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. Economics PhD Proposal

CAPRA members continued their discussion of the proposal and the reviews drafted by two committee members. CAPRA members were generally in favor of the proposal but had the following concerns: better justification of TA needs, more realistic projections of faculty growth in light of reduced recruitment this year and the feasibility of establishing the PhD program with current faculty, more alignment with the campus strategic academic focusing plan, the feasibility of recruiting and admitting the proposed number of PhD

students, and further elaboration on relying on non-resident tuition for international students.

ACTION: CAPRA to finalize the draft memo to the Senate Chair and submit by the deadline of October 3.

IV. Campus Space Planning and Prioritization

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed a communication that was previously submitted by a committee member to senior leadership. CAPRA discussed the possibility of using this communication as the basis for establishing a statement of space allocation. Confusion continues to reign among faculty regarding current and future space.

ACTION: CAPRA will draft a memo for committee review. This item will be included on future committee meeting agendas for further discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

Communication from a CAPRA member

- People are, in general, unhappy about the spaces that they have now or will get in the near future.
- The problem is here to stay for at least another 5 years, with little relief in sight.
- There is not enough space on campus for faculty, students, research staff, postdocs **AND** administrators.

The division of SE building 1 and 2 between SNS and SoE has been fraught with problems from the get go. The design of SE 2 doesn't match the needs of the Schools very well, the current faculty, and future research efforts. It is a beautiful looking building with limited usefulness. In my opinion, there are some guidelines from a faculty/student/research perspective that are most important.

- **All** faculty should have offices and Laboratories on the main campus. **No exceptions to this.**
- Postdocs and research staff need proper office spaces. They do the main body of research. Without them, we are not a proper Research I university.
- Graduate students are not cattle and they should not be warehoused in cubicle farms. They are precious resources and need proper space for them to carry out serious intellectual work.
- Administrators who do not need to interact with students or faculty in person should be located off campus: Castle, Promenade, Mondo, the new offices on G Street.
Convenience for day to day operations should not trump research and education.
- Administrators that meet with students could have offices on campus, but not in SE 1 or SE 2, which should be kept for faculty, researchers, and grad students first. AOA, COB, SSB, SSM, and off campus are alternatives.

Other ideas for maximization of space include some of the following:

- Storage space for field equipment, broken equipment, unused equipment, unused technology should be removed from labs and kept at Castle or another location. Nothing is more frustrating than to see high quality lab space warehousing items that take up valuable space.
- Designing labs by scientific groups, not random assignments, should be done by function as much as possible. For example, organic chemists should be co-located, as well as genomics faculty. Current faculty in SE1 may need to move to make this possible.
- By-law units should be given the prerogative to manage their own lab and office spaces. As an individual faculty members research waxes or wanes, adjustments should be made.
- Convert conference rooms in SE1 and SE2 to office spaces for postdocs, research staff, and graduate students, or even dry lab spaces for faculty.

The idea of keeping faculty at Castle or in a building off G Street makes no sense given that we are trying to build a competitive Research I University. There is very little that can replace the human interactions in this experience: faculty to faculty; student to faculty; research staff to student.