

**Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
(CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
April 3 2017**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 1:30 pm on April 3, 2017 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Mukesh Singhal presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Singhal reported that he attended the March 29 meeting of the Space Planning Allocation board and that the main topic was the formulation of a working group comprised of non-board members.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: the March 20 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. Academic Degree Program Policy (ADPP) Working Group

Professor Trounstine, CAPRA's representative on the ADPP working group, reported on the March 24 meeting. As requested by the working group, Professor Trounstine presented CAPRA's list of questions/thresholds that the committee would like to be incorporated into future proposals for new majors, minors, and units.

The other major item of discussion at the ADPP meeting was how majors and minors are affected when faculty cease teaching in these areas and begin teaching in other programs. The major and minors that faculty members "leave" are compelled to change their requirements, since they lack the faculty to teach the previously-required courses. CAPRA members agreed that a mechanism should be instituted whereby the affected majors/minors/programs should be informed in advance if any of their faculty will be leaving to teach in other areas. It is too late to address this in CAPRA's comments regarding the CRES major and MAD minor (deadline for Senate committee comments is April 3), but members agreed that this issue should be considered in future proposals. A CAPRA member suggested that

when SSHA responds to CAPRA's comments on the CRES major and MAD minor proposals regarding teaching, CAPRA should consult with IRDS on faculty teaching workload. Other members agreed with this course of action.

IV. Campus Physical Planning Committee (CPPC)

Professor Schnier, CAPRA's representative on the CPPC, reported on the March 16 meeting. Major topics of discussion included the new project to install solar panels in the North Bowl parking lot, and the progression of construction of the downtown campus.

V. SSHA Executive Committee Memo on Jurisdiction of Senate FTE lines

On March 21, the SSHA executive committee submitted to the Senate a list of questions related to the jurisdiction of Senate faculty FTE lines and requested input. Per the Senate Chair's request, CAPRA members were asked to review the memo, provide answers to the questions, and submit the answers to the Senate Chair for discussion at the April 20 Division Council meeting.

CAPRA members agreed that if the loss of an FTE line is due to the denial of tenure, then that line should remain with the unit and no justification should be necessary. For all other FTE line losses (separation, retirement), CAPRA members suggested the following draft answers to the Executive Committee's questions and will finalize them by April 14:

1) Is written justification for a vacant senate faculty FTE to remain in the unit required? If not, what criteria are used to determine if such justification is necessary?

Yes, written justification should be provided to the school Dean by the bylaw unit chair or the undergraduate chair of the affected program requesting that the vacated line remain within that unit or program. If the Dean agrees, he/she should forward his/her recommendation to CAPRA for review. (If the Dean disagrees with request, he/she must provide written justification to the

bylaw unit chair or undergraduate chair.) CAPRA's recommendation will thenceforth be submitted to the Provost/EVC for a decision.

2) What criteria are used to assess arguments made by a bylaw unit in support in retaining FTE?

What constitutes sufficient or insufficient justification for approval?

The same criteria currently used to request a new FTE: potential to strengthen research programs in existing or nascent programs/groups, support of undergraduate majors and undergraduate teaching needs, support of graduate education through student mentorship and graduate teaching, and ability to build connections with existing or proposed organized research units or academic units.

It is not under CAPRA's purview to define what constitutes sufficient or insufficient justification for approval.

3) At what administrative level (e.g., Dean, Provost) are such requests for justification initiated and finally decided? How are such decisions communicated?

The bylaw 55 unit chair or undergraduate program chair should initiate the request.

4) What, if any, is the process for appealing such decisions to either the appropriate body of the Academic Senate or the administration?

The Provost/EVC is the appropriate individual to whom appeals should be directed.

ACTION: CAPRA to finalize these answers by April 14 and then submit to the Senate Chair for Division Council's consideration at the April 20 Council meeting.

VI. Campus Review Items

- Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members drafted response memos to the following campus proposals: CRES major, MAD minor, English Honors program, and SOE bylaw units. A CAPRA member suggested a minor revision to the latter.

ACTION: CAPRA to send the four memos to the Senate Chair by close of business today

- CAPRA members continued their discussion of the General Education program proposal. Members agreed that the proposal contains several positive elements but is also resource-intensive with significant cost implications for staff, faculty, and the administration, in addition to impacts on physical space. Many units are struggling to offer a full range of discipline-specific courses for their undergraduate and graduate students. Virtually every major on campus will require resources to deliver the different components of the proposed program. CAPRA members suggested working with the units to review resource needs and timelines and reconsidering alternate timelines to implement the GE program.

ACTION: CAPRA to finalize its comments on the General Education program proposal and send to the proposal's authors by close of business on April 5.

VII. Systemwide Review Items

- Presidential Policy on Export Controls
ACTION: the Senate Chair will be informed that CAPRA declines to comment.
- Second round revisions to Senate Bylaw 336.
ACTION: the Senate Chair will be informed that CAPRA declines to comment.

- Proposed revisions to APM 285, 210, 133, 740 pertaining to the L(P)SOE series. The proposed modifications would re-designate the title of this series to “Teaching Professor.”

ACTION: the Senate Chair will be informed that CAPRA endorses the proposed revisions by majority vote, but the minority believes the title is not appropriate.

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

Attest:

Mukesh Singhal, CAPRA Chair