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Minutes

**Attendance:** Provost Don DeHayes, *Chairperson*, Peter Larsen, *Vice Chairperson*, Marilyn Barbour, Laura Beauvais, Michael Honhart, Valerie Maier-Speredelozzi, Ann Morrissey, Norbert Mundorf, Kat Quina, Michael Rice, Vern Wyman

**Guest in attendance:** Gary Boden, Senior Information Technologist, Institutional Research Office

**Members Absent:** Peter Alfonso, Chris Caisse, Scott Martin, Lynn McKinney, Jason Pina, Nasser Zawia

1. **The meeting was called to order at 3:09 PM.** Minutes of the January 19, 2012 meeting were approved.

2. **Announcements**

   a. The Provost distributed documents pertaining to the URI Cluster Hiring Initiative: a draft summary of cluster themes and topics, a statement of goals, and a draft of the RFP. It is hoped that the RFP will be finalized in a week. The cover letter will invite multiple proposals for each cluster topic. Interested faculty will be encouraged to collaborate on proposals. It is hoped that faculty will be more focused on advancing the initiatives rather than on acquiring new faculty in their departments. A means of measuring success will have to be determined, possibly after three years.

   b. Senator Michael Rice, FSEC representative on JCAP, announced his resignation from the committee. He will be replaced by Senator Kathleen Davis commencing with the March 29, 2012 meeting.

3. **Advancing Interdisciplinary Activities**
   
   Discussion at the Academic Summit (Jan. 2012) about interdisciplinary activities and cluster hires subsequently led to concern about the obstacles to interdisciplinary research, program development, and team teaching. Questions about how interdisciplinary programs would be administered and how credit would be assigned need to be addressed. The Provost proposed that the Task Force Subcommittee focus on this issue by exploring perceived obstacles and develop systemic and structural goals to advance interdisciplinary studies. This subcommittee would be asked to produce a written report to JCAP. Potential
subcommittee members were identified: Provost DeHayes, Norbert Mundorf, and Lynn McKinney. It was hoped that one or two additional people would join this group.

4. Updates from Subcommittees

Metrics
Gary Boden, Senior Information Technologist, Institutional Research Office summarized recent data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). He distributed documentation titled, College Means Comparisons, November 2011, a report that identifies significant differences between the perceptions of first-year and senior year students based on voluntary survey results (administered by Indiana University). The results are designed to provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time, what they gain from attending college, and help identify “Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice,” practices associated with desired outcomes of college. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience that can be improved. The data are not longitudinal. The URI response rate was 23%; nationally, it was 33%. The series of questions defined as Enriching Educational Experiences produced above average results among the freshman responses. The benchmark items related to encouragement and support, extending to the quality of advising, indicated values lower at the senior level than the freshman level across many colleges.

It was suggested that results be discussed at the college and departmental levels. A Chairs Forum devoted to these data was recommended.

Going forward, it would be desirable to obtain higher numbers of participants. The institution could consider ways of follow-up with seniors who were surveyed as freshman.

5. New Program Approval Process

Marilyn Barbour distributed by email a draft of the proposed New Program Approval Process (attached). The proposed changes will require some changes to the Senate Manual. The plan calls for JCAP to be involved at a pre-proposal level to indicate engagement with Academic Plan (Step 1). Any proposal submitted to JCAP will require dean’s level support. Resources will be addressed at the dean’s level. Space and facilities needs should be addressed as part of the budget evaluation. The budget evaluation and review by involved or affected departments are steps in the process that have been moved to earlier stages (Step 2). Approval by the Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee is also part of Step 2. The Council of Deans will review the proposal for academic rigor (Step 3).

A form to accompany the RIGBHE form(s) needs to be developed for this new process. A subcommittee will be convened to produce the new form. It is hoped that this work can be accomplished in time to propose manual changes at the April 19th Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06PM.
New Program Proposal Process  URI
Yellow Highlight= Action step has moved
Blue Highlight= Action step needing to be added to Manual language

Step 1:
Pre-proposal
  a) Program Director and Dean complete JCAP required form documenting connection to Academic Plan and justification
  b) JCAP provides comment/recommendation to Program Director and Dean

Step 2:
Proposal—At Program/College Level
  a) Program Director and faculty committee create full proposal using the RIBGHE approved format
  b) Committee seeks review by Departments directly involved or affected by new program (this is suggested by Laura Beauvais, moving the process earlier)
  c) Committee must consult with SLOAA for learning outcomes assessment
  d) Required Approval by LOOC suggested at this time
  e) Budget evaluation required (this is suggested by the Provost, moving the process earlier)
  f) Program proposal approved by College Curriculum Committee

Step 3: (Facilitated by the administrator of the Review/Coordinating Committee)
Proposal—Outside of College for Approval
  a) Library Impact Statement required
  b) LOOC Approval required for learning outcomes assessment, if not previously obtained
  c) Council of Deans’ review

Step 4:
Proposal—Receipt and Evaluation by Review/Coordinating Committee (e.g., Curricular Affairs Committee, Graduate Council, Council for Research)
  a) Approval or send back to Program Director/faculty committee for questions

IF APPROVED:

Step 5: Faculty Senate Vote and Approval
Step 6: President Approval
Step 7: RI Board of Governors for Higher Education Approval