The annual report (Summary of activities) From José Luis Suárez-García, CUP chair

I. Dates of meetings held. Two meetings online scheduled via Zoom: Feb. 9, Second meeting scheduled with two members not able to participate in the first meeting (meeting content completed via email)

Agenda and documents discussed:

1. Evaluation of the new application. 6 in favor of approval (one of them approval with reservation); 2 against approval. (Following the CUP meeting all members supported the new application)
2. Biennial reports. the main report has Report Synopsis
   a. 2 CIOSUs are recommended for termination by the Dean or Overseeing Administrator. The committee accepted such recommendation.
   b. 18 CIOSUs are recommended for continuation (unanimous rec. by the 3 CUP members evaluating)
   c. 4 CIOSUs have some questions marks by one com. member (3 members indicated "continuation" as final recommendation; the 4 CIOSUs were also approved for continuation following the CUP meeting)
   d. 1 (One) CIOSU received the following marks:
      i. Continuation with Reservation /Continuation/Termination
      ii. CIOSU approved for continuation at the CUP meeting.

The CUP group continued evaluating centers that (from our point of view and following the evaluation guidelines) have, or seem to have, issues with the number of units.

   a. Approved

   The Center for Science and Communication (CSC)

   b. Not approved

   N/A

2. Regular Biennial report (Summary/Synopsis enclosed doc. to the committee):
   o Total 25 CIOSUs evaluated. All reports had 2 or 3 evaluators (CUP chair evaluated all CIOSU applications)
- 18 CIOSUs received “Continuation” recommendation by all evaluators
- 1 New application (Center for Science Communication)
- 2 CIOSUs received Termination recommendation (Requested. CIOSU Dean/Director/Overseeing administrator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnetic Materials and Applied Magnetics Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Instrument Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some CIOSUs have received comments expressing concerns or deficiencies (CIOSU Guidelines), in most cases connected to the budget and/or the # of units. None of the CIOSUs evaluated under this group received a majority in favor of Termination; nevertheless, this is an important issue that needs the CUP attention and discussion. to be done this semester.

II. **Membership and attendance.** We had two meetings (via Zoom) and numerous email conversations to discuss issues related to the CIOSU applications (annual reviews and new applications). I (CUP chair) had several email exchanges and online meetings with Dinaida Egan to discuss issue related to the documents under evaluation. Because of the complexity of having meetings (online or in person) with all CIOSU members, most of the CUP work was handled online (meeting with individuals) or via email. One student representative participated in our discussions. All CUP members have regularly been available, and supportive of our work as committee.

III. **Substantive matters (issues) brought to the committee.**
Since Fall the committee worked with the following main issues:
- Election of a new committee chair
  - Jose Luis Suárez-García, Professor, Languages, Literatures and Cultures;
- Evaluation of biennial applications (fully completed online during the Winter break).
  - Meeting to discuss the results held in Spring prior to submitting our report to Faculty Council
  a) Full evaluation of new applications (one approved)
  b) Initial evaluation of issues concerning CIOUS guidelines. Pending full evaluation of the issue.

IV. **The outcome of the response or recommendation**
Recommendations submitted to Faculty Council in Spring 2023 and approved by Faculty Council.
- Applications are recommended for renewal/continuation (23)
- Applications not recommended for renewal/continuation (2)
- Comments on the evaluation process.
- New applications (1 recommended to have CIOSU status)

V. **Spring Semester.**
Completed and outcomes.
1. Completion of the CUP reports with Faculty Council discussion and approval.
2. CUP chair contacted by other CIOSUs to evaluate the possibility of using the CIOSU Change form (for structural changes to be done prior to the new biennial evaluation process) created in 2022 for internal changes in the CIOSU structure.
3. Provided feedback (on campus meeting and numerous emails) to the application evaluated in Spring (and approved by CUP and Faculty Council)
4. CUP chair met with Faculty Council (Executive Comm. and General FC) to present all CUP reports (biennial report and new applications).

5. Still pending: Changes in the CIOSU guidelines to have a more flexible evaluation of applications and include a more inclusive language in the guidelines.

6. A number of new centers (interested in CIOSU status) requested support from CUP (several emails and online conferences with CUP chair) to prepare applications to be submitted in the future.

7. Support to existing CIOSUs that had questions related to potential changes in their existing administration structure/operations.

- **Final note.** A final note to express my sincere gratitude to the committee and three individuals (Sue Doe (Faculty Council Chair), Dinaida Egan (OPVR) and Amy Barkley (Executive Assistant to the Faculty Council) for their constant personal and professional support in the last two years that I have chaired the Committee on University Programs.

Respectfully submitted,

*Jose Luis Suárez-García, CUP chair*

**Supporting documents enclosed:**

1. Reports from the CUP sent and evaluated by Faculty Council (Executive comm. first and then by general FC)

2. Summary of Report on biennial applications, and new application used by the CUP during the evaluation process, also presented at FC.

3. Supporting document with general information presented at FC to discuss the new CIOSU application