

MEMORANDUM

To: Thomas Schildgen, Chair of the University Academic Council
From: Eduardo Pagán, Chair, Curriculum and Academic Programs Committee (CAPC)
Date: 21 April 2014
Subject: Year-End Report

During AY 2013-2014 we will have convened 8 meetings and we have reviewed 114 curricular proposals to date. Thus, in the fall of 2013, CAPC reviewed 70 proposals over 4 meetings, and in the spring of 2014, CAPC will have reviewed 34 proposals over 4 meetings (we expect that this final tally will change due to approximately graduate program 8 proposals and 10-12 undergraduate proposals slated for the final 1 May CAPC meeting of this year).

CAPC ran smoothly due in large part to the dedicated work of Phyllis Lucie, senior Program Coordinator, and her assistant Lauren Leo. They created the agenda, insured that proposals were complete, contacted all proposers to arrange for their presence at meetings, followed up on all tabled proposals and those passed with conditions, as well as facilitated proposers in negotiating the process and contacted proposers if revisions were needed before proposals come before CAPC. Their work and contributions to a smooth-running review process were invaluable.

There were, however, a few developments in the review of proposals during this past year that bears some reflection because of implications for the coming years.

First, during the year it became clear that some faculty senators were unaware of their responsibility to review all new course proposals, as well as all program proposals, that come before the Senate for a vote. Why this was so I cannot speculate, but it became clear that senators needed to be reminded of their integral role in the review process. Once this was discovered, Chuck Barbee did an excellent job of making this responsibility clear in all communications that went out of the Senate office. It is my strong recommendation that in addition to Chuck's reminders in all draft agendas, either the CAPC chair or the UAC chair must take a moment during the first Senate meeting of every term to review the advisory capacity of CAPC as a Senate Committee, and the responsibility of all senators to actively review all motions presented before they come to a vote.

Second, a subcommittee was established specifically to arbitrate any course or programmatic conflicts that might arise between units. This subcommittee does not exist as a permanent part of CAPC, and I strongly recommend that Bylaws be created to ensure that it does.

Third, and finally, I also strongly advise that CAPC appoint a vice-chair in the case that the chair cannot attend a meeting, or may have to step down for unforeseen reasons. This vice chair also does not exist as a formal position, and could be included in creating Bylaws for the committee.