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Joint Committee on Academic Planning (JCAP)
Thursday, March 29, 2012
3-4:30 PM
Alumni Center Board Room

Minutes

Attendance: Provost Don DeHayes, Chairperson, Peter Larsen, Vice Chairperson, Marilyn Barbour, Laura Beauvais, Kathleen Davis, Michael Honhart, Valerie Maier-Speredelozzi, Lynn McKinney, Ann Morrissey, Norbert Mundorf, Jack Szczepanski, Nasser Zawia

Guest in attendance: David Byrd (incoming JCAP Vice Chairperson, 2012-2013)

Members Absent: Peter Alfonso, Chris Caisse, Scott Martin, Jason Pina, Kat Quina, Vern Wyman

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:07 PM. Minutes of the February 16, 2012 meeting were approved.

2. Announcements

   a. The Provost announced that the common reading book for Summer/Fall 2012 has been selected: Mountains Beyond Mountains, The Quest of Dr. Paul Farmer, a Man Who Would Cure the World, by Tracy Kidder. Paul Farmer is one of the founders of Partners In Health, a non-profit, international health and social justice organization, whose physician members donate primary health care in impoverished nations. The Provost has been encouraged by the use of the URI Common Reading blog during the summer. 1000 students contributed last year. The Honors Colloquium will have a health related theme this fall; one of the Honors classes will adopt this book as a reading. Copies of the book are available to JCAP members (contact the Provost’s Office).

      A suggestion was made to provide an e-book reader version next year.

   b. The new Office of Experiential Learning and Community Engagement was formally recognized today at a breakfast event. Speakers included Governor Lincoln Chafee; about 130-150 people attended the event. The office provides internships, community service opportunities, and project-based learning experiences.
c. Freshman applications have exceeded 20,500 for Fall 2012. Applications to URI have increased at a time when URI’s peer institutions have experienced a decrease in applications. The demographic pool is shrinking.

d. Vice Chairperson Larsen introduced David Byrd, Professor and Director of the School of Education who will be the Faculty Senate Vice Chair in the fall (2012). As such, he will become the Vice Chair of JCAP.

3. Advancing Interdisciplinary Activities

Challenges to interdisciplinary collaborations were discussed:

a. Overwhelming popularity of the new health studies program has prompted some departments to second-guess their ability to deliver the curriculum.

b. Cross-listing: obtaining approval from other colleges for cross-listing can be problematic. Discussions become necessary.

• How can a department anticipate the impact?
• How are resources determined?
• The course may be an elective on one department but a required course in another department.
• Desired course length may differ between departments.
• Consider the department and the discipline; thinking in terms of the discipline can unify departmental division.
• Cross-listing is not necessarily co-teaching.
• How are credit hours split equitably when each of two professors is contributing 75%?

c. Department chairs will be required to manage interdisciplinary enrollment in order to maintain productivity. Enrollment is not expanding. If interdisciplinary courses are growing, there is shrinkage elsewhere.

4. New Program Approval Process

Senator Barbour distributed proposed Manual language changes for the new program proposal process (sections 8.85.10 – 8.85.31) (document attached to minutes). Vice Provost Beauvais distributed a draft of the pre-proposal form (attached). Section 8.85.13 is all new language. It was suggested that a flow chart be constructed to facilitate the understanding of the process. “Cook book” type instructions and the (JCAP) pre-proposal form would be linked on the Faculty Senate website.

The Budget Office will have a chance to scrutinize the proposal at an earlier stage in the procedure. The endorsement of the dean at the pre-proposal stage indicates his/her awareness of college funding obligations.
The function of the pre-proposal is to expedite new program approvals. The role of JCAP will be to assess consistency of a proposal idea with the AP. If the proposal idea is determined not to fit, JCAP can recommend that it be revised and resubmitted. The role of JCAP will be to comment and make recommendations, i.e.,

- the proposal idea is consistent with the Academic Plan. Proceed with the next step of the process.
- the proposal idea is not consistent with the Academic Plan. The proposer is urged to develop the idea further and resubmit a revised pre-proposal.
- the proposal is not consistent with the Academic Plan. The proposer is urged to reconsider the idea and may submit a new pre-proposal.

All communications between JCAP and the proposers will be copied to the appropriate coordinating and review committee (CAC, Grad Council, etc). Pre-proposals will be reviewed by a “New Program Review Subcommittee” of JCAP that will report to the full JCAP membership. Electronic communication between the subcommittee and the full committee will expedite the process. Pre-proposal assessment can take place outside of the JCAP meetings.

Revisions will be discussed at the next JCAP meeting and manual language changes will possibly be presented for a vote at the May 10th Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Barbour, Vice Provost Beauvais, and Senate Coordinator Sheila Black Grubman were thanked for their efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40PM.
Chapter 8 - Regulations for Students

Part III - Procedure for Approval and Review of Courses, Programs and other Academic Ventures

Part III contains rules and regulations governing procedures for the approval of courses, programs, centers, institutes and bureaus, and procedures for review of new programs and for periodic review of existing programs.

Programs

8.85.10 New Programs. In this section the term "program" shall be understood to include any curriculum or University sponsored activity requiring the assignment of one or more faculty to serve in a teaching, research, or service capacity and intended to result in the conferral of a certificate or other credential or of an undergraduate or graduate degree. It also covers centers, including partnerships, bureaus, institutes, and similar entities. Section 8.90 covers the review and approval of centers, including partnerships, bureaus, institutes, and similar entities.

8.85.11 A coordinating and review committee (see 8.85.17) shall be responsible for receiving a proposal for a new program, for notifying the appropriate units of the University of the proposal, for requesting Budget Office financial review of the proposal, for calling for comment on the proposal, for setting deadlines for receipt of comment, for evaluating the proposed program, for insuring that all required information is included or appended to the proposal, and for forwarding the proposal, or a revised version of the proposal, with its report and recommendations, to the Faculty Senate for subsequent action. In its report to the Senate, the coordinating and review committee shall indicate whether it recommends approval or disapproval of the proposal and may recommend a ranking of the proposal according to categories described in 8.85.30.

8.85.12 Proposals shall be prepared using formats and criteria specified by the Rhode Island Board of Governors for Higher Education and kept on file in the office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

8.85.13 A submitted proposal shall include the following steps:

a) Prior to developing a complete proposal for a new academic program, a brief pre-proposal (2 page) describing justification for the concept, its centrality to the mission of the university and its connectivity to the Academic Plan shall be provided by the proposer(s), department chair(s) (if applicable) and academic dean(s) to JCAP for review and comment.
b) While the proposal is being developed within the college, the proposer(s) shall seek consultation with SLOAA in preparation of its plan for student learning assessment and thereafter obtain approval by LOOC of its plan. The proposer shall also obtain a library impact statement following proper review by the University Libraries and seek written comment from other university departments and programs perceived impacted by the proposal. After the library impact statement and comment from other departments are obtained, the proposer(s) shall complete the budget analysis using the approved RIBGHE forms (http://www.ribghe.org/publicreg.htm). Review and approval by the budget office is required.

c) After section b is completed, the proposal submitted by a college shall have been approved in accordance with the college's established procedures and with approval of the Dean, before submission to the coordinating and review committee. If more than one college is proposing the new program, approval must be obtained from each prior to submission.

8.85.14 The coordinating and review committee shall insure that all departments, colleges, or other units directly or potentially involved or affected by a proposal for a new program, including the Joint Educational Policy Committee and the Council of Deans, are informed of the proposal and are given time to comment or otherwise respond. Unless otherwise sanctioned by a special act of the Faculty Senate, the coordinating and review committee shall allow at least thirty (30) and no more than forty-five (45) calendar days for responses after public notification.

8.85.15 Unless an extension of up to thirty (30) calendar days has been authorized by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the coordinating and review committee shall submit its report on the proposal to the Faculty Senate for action no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the deadline set for receipt of responses on a proposal. If a report has not been submitted within the specified time, the proposal may be submitted directly to the Faculty Senate for action.

8.85.16 The coordinating and review committee may require changes in the format of and may recommend substantive changes in a proposal before forwarding it to the Senate for action. The coordinating and review committee shall make comments submitted in response to a proposal available for inspection, indicating in its forwarding report to the Senate the persons and/or groups who have submitted comments and where the comments are on file and available for review.

8.85.17 Normally, the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Graduate Council, and the Council for Research shall serve as the coordinating and review committee respectively for proposals for new undergraduate degree programs, for new graduate degree programs, and for new centers, including partnerships, bureaus and institutes. If questions arise as to the appropriate committee to serve as the coordinating and review committee for a proposal for a new program, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall determine which committee has responsibility. The Executive Committee may establish or recommend establishing a special committee to serve as the coordinating and review committee for a proposal.

8.85.20 Evaluation Criteria. In conducting their review, the coordinating and review committee shall evaluate the proposed program primarily according to the following criteria, listed in order of importance and explained in more detail in the Manual.
sections indicated: centrality of the program to the mission of the University of Rhode Island (8.85.21); extent to which the program would contribute to the University's fulfillment of its teaching, research and service responsibilities, (8.85.22); relationship of the program to the developmental plans of the University (8.85.23); projected cost effectiveness considerations (8.85.24).

8.85.21 The first criterion--centrality to the mission of the University of Rhode Island--is of major importance. The mission of the University of Rhode Island is embodied in its name and consists of two components -- one being those responsibilities that distinguish it as a University (not a state or community college or technical institute) and the other being those local and regional concerns that derive from its being "of Rhode Island." A program is considered as being central to the mission of this University as an institution of higher learning to the extent it fulfills both aspects of the University's mission. A program shall be considered appropriate to the mission of U.R.I. as a University to the extent to which it fits one of the following descriptions:

a. the program constitutes a theoretical pursuit;

b. the program contains many aspects of practical application, but these aspects require a strong theoretical foundation (e.g. certain professional programs, applied fine arts, etc.);

c. the program provides some general skills needed for students to be able to engage in theoretical pursuits or to understand the theoretical foundations of practical aspects of other programs. Taking into consideration the present situation within higher education, a university must, in this context, also provide skills which are judged by some to be remedial in nature.

A program may be considered appropriate to the mission of U.R.I. as an institution of higher learning of Rhode Island to the extent it fits one of the following descriptions:

a. the program is of general or universal interest or applicability — one that typically exists at all quality universities;

b. the program is in keeping with the mission of a land-grant institution (e.g. agricultural experiment station, cooperative extension program);

c. the program has special regional or local relevance because of its relationship to social/demographic characteristics of the geographical area, unique collaborative opportunities with institutions or organizations in the area, or present and projected employment opportunities or needs of the area.

8.85.22 A second criterion of major importance is the extent to which the program contributes to the University's fulfillment of its three main responsibilities: to provide the opportunity for education at the undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels; to conduct research and other scholarly and creative activities; and to serve the people of the state by making knowledge, information, and expertise available to individuals, to other educational organizations, and to business, industry, and government. It is envisioned that review of a program with respect to this criterion will be the most time-consuming and thoroughgoing component of the review.
process. In carrying out this aspect of its task, the subcommittee reviewing an identified program shall interview faculty, students and staff involved in the program, program directors, department chairpersons, and the appropriate dean. The committee shall examine the record of opportunities and accomplishments that derive from the program including examination of the following:

a. What opportunities does the program make available which are not otherwise available to the people of the state?

b. How does program effectiveness measure up based on national reputation, peer evaluation, accreditation reviews, and test scores of program graduates on licensing exams, graduate record exams, etc.?

c. How much research support is obtained by faculty associated with the program? What is the quality and quantity of scholarly activity, both sponsored and unsponsored, in terms of national reputation and other measures?

d. What special University, community, state services are provided by faculty or students associated with the program?

8.85.23 A third criterion of major importance is the relationship of the program to developmental plans (e.g., Academic Plan) of the University. Is the program inside or outside the areas where greater emphasis is envisioned?

8.85.24 A fourth set of criteria related to cost/effectiveness considerations, of less importance than the three defined in paragraphs 8.85.21-23, shall include the following:

a. How is does the program projected to compare with others based on cost/revenue relationships (overall cost and income and per student)?

b. How is does the program projected to compare with others based on numbers of students served (majors, etc.)?

c. How is does the program projected to compare with others considering student-faculty ratio?

d. How is does the program projected to compare with others in terms of employment opportunities and actual placement of graduates?

e. Are there special facilities or equipment needed or uniquely available for the program?

This set of criteria shall be applied uniformly to all programs as far as such criteria are relevant.

8.85.30 Classification of Programs for which funding is required. When new programs are approved by the Faculty Senate, approval may be classified as follows: approval Class A will mean that the program is deemed to be of such merit as to justify the recommendation of the immediate allocation of funds for its implementation; approval Class B would recommend that proposed new programs compete for
resources on an equal basis with all other University activities; approval Class C would recommend funding of the proposed new program should additional funds be made available to the University. #05-06--21

8.85.31 Programs for which no new funding is required. When the proponents of a new program, including a certificate program, assert that the new venture can be administered entirely with existing funds, the proposal shall include a five-year plan demonstrating that existing funds are sufficient for carrying the program. Prior to that plan being presented to the Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee or the Graduate Council, it shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate department(s) and college(s) whose participation is necessary for the program to be offered successfully. The plan shall also include a Budget Office review. No classification under 8.85.30 is required. #05-06--21
Attachment B

DRAFT

JCAP Pre-Proposal for New Programs

Program Name: ____________________________________________________________

Degree Type: _____________________________________________________________

Proposer: __________________________________________________________________

Department(s): ___________________________________________________________

College(s): ______________________________________________________________

Part 1. Describe program:


Part 2: How does the program connect to the mission of the University and the focus areas of the Academic Plan?


Part 3: Provide justification for support of this program in terms of its viability, feasibility, student and societal demand, and ????


Signatures:

Proposer _______________________________ Date: ________________

Chair(s) _______________________________ Date: ________________

Dean(s): _______________________________ Date: ________________

JCAP Comment and Recommendations: