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JCAP Meeting Minutes 08-12-2010

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate
1) Organizational Issues

Provost DeHayes reviewed the charge of this committee.

The committee will:

   a. Be advisory to the Provost’s Office and the Faculty Senate.
   b. Oversee the review of the Academic Plan each year, monitoring its progress and necessary revisions.
   c. Be responsible for periodic and systematic review of the University relative to NEASC accreditation and work towards ensuring the university’s progress and improvements.

Discussion took place about the role of the committee in monitoring the institutional effectiveness standard that was formerly identified in the University’s last NEASC report as part of the role of the now former JSPC. This committee would need to consider that role.

A question was raised concerning how the JCAP was expected to work with the SBPC. Since the JCAP’s purview is the updating of academic strategic planning priorities and weighing those priorities, they would assist the Provost in clarifying priorities relative to the Academic Plan. The role of the SBPC revolves around making budgetary recommendations based on the defined strategic priorities of the University and the various divisions. The Academic Plan and other divisional plans play a key role in the deliberations of the SBPC. The overlap in membership between the two committees will also serve to enhance communication and integration in the planning and budgeting work relative to each committee.

Discussion took place about the optimal working structure for the JCAP. The Provost suggested working in subcommittees and that these subcommittees would meet more regularly during each month and the
entire JCAP would start out by meeting monthly during the fall semester. The consensus from the committee was that this structure would allow for more work to be accomplished relative to the mission of the group. There was also discussion as to whether these subcommittees would exist for a short span or longer term. This will be decided later after some experience. The subcommittees were determined to be as follows:

a) NEASC subcommittee
b) Key Indicators/Metrics subcommittee
c) Task Force Coordination subcommittee

A list of all of the Academic Planning Task Forces was distributed to the group. The group requested that the two additional longer-term task forces that were not indicated on the list be added to it (Enrollment Management Committee and the Academic Affairs Diversity Committee). Discussion ensued as to whether the task force recommendations would be considered by the whole group or the subcommittee. It was agreed that these reports would be shared and circulated to the entire committee since they would be useful for all to consider. The subcommittee will break down the recommendations and develop a draft prioritizing for the full committee’s review. Since some of task forces have submitted reports to the Provost already, these could be sent to the committee for review immediately. The Provost will forward others to the committee as the task forces submit them to him.

2) NEASC Update:

Laura Beauvais reported that the NEASC Focused visit is scheduled for October 31st – November 2nd. The visit is focused on 3 main areas:

a) Academic planning and budgeting
b) Academic program review
c) University organizational governance and structure

Committee members should make note of dates, as they will likely be asked to meet with the reviewers during that time. Ann Morrissey noted that a draft preliminary report has been written with the help of various people around campus. Currently, an initial round of feedback is being sought from a variety of people at the University including the President, Vice Presidents, Deans, the FSEC and the APRC. Comments are due by August 18th. The committee will receive a copy of the draft report in the afternoon following the meeting and feedback is welcome. She noted that many on the committee participate in other groups who have already received the draft report.
3). Monitoring the Plan Progress:

The Provost indicated that we are already seven months into the academic plan and a set of key indicators is needed. Ann Morrissey distributed a document containing possible key indicators that might be considered by JCAP as a starting point in developing metrics and key indicators to measure progress on the Academic Plan 2010-15. The document contained 21 pages of indicators that could be considered. The Key Indicators subcommittee will consider this document.

3) Task Force Recommendations

It was agreed that each member of the committee is expected to serve on one subcommittee. The subcommittees were formed as follows:

Key indicators – Jason Pina, Kat Quina, Chris Anderson, Peter Larsen, Ann Morrissey, Nasser Zawia,
NEASC – Lori Ciccomascolo, Laura Beauvais, Marilyn Barbour, Lynn McKinney, Vern Wyman, Sandy Hicks
Task Force Coordination - Peter Alfonso, Nancy Eaton, Don DeHayes, Norbert Mundorf, David Coates

4) Follow up:

a) Each subcommittee should have a point person or convener for organizing themselves.
b) Subcommittees should begin meeting immediately. Conveners have been identified to call and coordinate work of subcommittees.
c) It was agreed that a Sakai site would be set up for internal Communication and a webpage linked from both the Provost’s site and the Faculty Senate website would be set up for external/campus community communication.
d) Monthly meetings will be scheduled through December.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.