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UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
FACULTY SENATE

BILL
Adopted by the Faculty Senate

TO: President Francis H. Horn

FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The Attached BILL, titled Procedures for approval of Graduate Programs and resulting in a change in the charge to the Committee on Curricular Affairs giving the committee jurisdiction over curriculums or programs leading to degrees or credit certificates awarded by the University in any of its division, is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.

3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on April 19, 1966.

4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Trustees, completing the appropriate endorsement below.

5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on May 10, 1966, three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Trustees for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Trustees, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

April 22, 1966
(date)

Chairman of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: President of the University

1. Returned.


3. (If approved). In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Trustees is not necessary.

May 3, 1966
(date)

President

Form approved 11/65
ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.

2. Approved.

(date) /s/ President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Chairman of the Board of Trustees, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

(date) /s/ (Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

(date) /s/ President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

May 9, 1966 (date) /s/ Elizabeth W. Grandall
Chairman of the Faculty Senate
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
CRITERIA FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS REQUIRING SENATE APPROVAL

submitted April 14, 1966

Alternate Recommendations: EITHER

1. That the words "at the baccalaureate level or lower" be stricken from Section 4.23.16 of the Faculty Manual, Seventh Edition, Revised, June, 1965, and that the section be changed to read:

4.23.16 The establishment, modification, or abolition of all curriculums or programs of study leading to degrees or credit certificates awarded by the University in any of its divisions, with due regard for accreditation when applicable.

OR

2. That, when the Graduate Council formally approves programs of study leading to graduate degrees that have already been approved by the Faculty Senate, the Dean of the Graduate school will forward simultaneously identical copies (initialed by him) to:

1) The Chairman of the Faculty Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs, for inclusion in the "Informational" Section of the Committee's report to the Senate.

2) The Registrar

3) The Editor of the Catalog

4) The President of the University

Comments:

At the meeting of the Faculty Senate on May 27, 1965, Senator Elizabeth W. Crandall made the following motion, which was passed by the Senate:

"In order to insure consistency of action in the future, I therefore move that the Dean of the Graduate School and the Incoming Chairman of the Committee on Curricular Affairs, acting as an ad hoc committee, be requested 1) to formulate a list of criteria for determining which graduate programs require action by the Graduate Council, the Committee on Curricular Affairs, and the Senate, and 2) to propose procedures for informing members of the Faculty of those programs which do not require formal action by these bodies."

The motion arose out of comments on then recent releases in the Report of the University of Rhode Island, 1963-64, the Providence Evening Bulletin of May 17, and the Narragansett Times of May 20, publicizing new programs of study at the University of Rhode Island, namely a special graduate program in reading for teachers and a masters program in ocean engineering, about neither of which had any official notification been given to the CCA or the Faculty Senate. In her memorandum dated September 27, 1965, formally appointing the committee, Mrs. Crandall noted that, during the time after she made her motion and before writing the memorandum, a question had arisen "as to what procedures should be followed
in initiating the offering of graduate programs through the Division of University Extension." She suggested that the committee might include this problem in its deliberations.

The University of Rhode Island Faculty Manual, Seventh Edition, Revised, June, 1965, pp. 32c and 33, charges the CCA as follows:

4.23 Committee on Curricular Affairs (November 8, 1962)

4.23.1 To study and make recommendations on the following matters to the Faculty Senate.

* * * *

4.23.12 The establishment or abolition of undergraduate and graduate degrees or credit certificates awarded by the University, in any of its Divisions.

* * * *

4.23.16 The establishment, modification, or abolition of all curriculums or programs of study leading to degrees or credit certificates at the baccalaureate level or lower, with due regard to accreditation when applicable.

4.23.17 The introduction, modification, or abolition of individual courses of instruction.

An analysis of these charges would indicate that each of the degrees announced in the press last spring covers an area of concentration under an existing degree, but it would also point up the problem of defining what is to constitute a new degree. That appears to be the sense of the first part of the motion.

In addition, there becomes quite apparent the lack of consistency cited in Senator Crandall's motion: although, under the terms of the charges, the CCA is involved with the establishment of both undergraduate and graduate degrees and with the establishment of both undergraduate and graduate courses, its jurisdiction over the establishment of curriculums or programs of study is limited to those at the undergraduate level. A probable reason for this restriction is a matter of history: at the time the CCA was being introduced, the Graduate Faculty was being established, and it was thought best to relegate approval of new programs of study at the graduate level to the Graduate Faculty. In the spring of 1965, however, with the approval by the Graduate Faculty of the Metz Report, many of the functions of the Graduate Faculty, including this one, were delegated to the Graduate Council.

As the procedure now stands, a departmental curriculum or program of study leading to any Master of Science, Master of Arts, or Doctor of Philosophy degree, not further identified, becomes official once it has the approval of the Graduate Council. Unless the degree is a new one, neither the CCA nor the Senate has any responsibilities in connection with it. The problem seems to be whether the definition or the interpretation of "new degree" ought to include any new program of study, any new combination of old programs of study, or both. These possibilities would constitute the criteria asked for in the motion.
The present procedure, efficient though it is, has potential breakdowns, two of which have become apparent very recently. In its 28th Report to the Faculty Senate, submitted and approved on March 17, 1966, the CCA noted two new programs of study leading to the Master of Science degree, namely, the one in geology and the one in physical education. (Such notice is not prescribed; however, this year, in the attempt to carry out the sense of the second part of Mrs. Crandall's motion, the Committee has tried to use the "Informational" section of its formal reports to the Senate to inform the members of the Faculty of such changes.) The Committee was made aware of the program in physical education early in its development because of the need to approve several new courses that were being introduced to support the degree. On the other hand, the program in geology was drawn up from extant courses; and, even though it was subsequently approved by the Graduate Council and quite properly published in their minutes, it was not until the financial offices of the University questioned requests to expend monies in connection with the program and the Chairman of the CCA was called in to track it down, that the program came to his attention, and, subsequently, to that of the CCA and the Senate. No one can be held to blame in the matter: the publication of the minutes of the Graduate Council ended their responsibilities; and the CCA, under the current interpretation of its charge, had none to begin with. The problem now focuses on the disposition of a graduate program not requiring approval of the CCA and the Senate.

In this connection, an additional inconsistency occurred with the publication in the press of the approval by the Board of Trustees of the "degree" in physical education, with no mention of the program in geology (reported to the Senate at the same time). Several interested members of the Faculty have questioned whether the approval of the Board of Trustees of the program (NOT the degree) in physical education was necessary; and if so, then whether it is necessary for all such programs.

It is apparent that the Administrative officers and the Faculty have become accustomed to the channels through which flow the usual matters involving curricular affairs, to the extent that some of them are not aware of the procedures set up for the special cases of the graduate programs in question. Many of these people assume that they are the same as for all other curricular matters. Therefore, with the sole aim of regularizing this anomaly, the Chairman of the CCA offers Recommendation 1.

On the other hand, Recommendation 2 is supported by the Dean of the Graduate School, because it defines the status quo and offers mechanics for keeping the CCA, the Faculty Senate, and the Administration informed of actions resulting from the present procedure. It must be pointed out also that the Metz Report set up certain safeguards that allow both for access of Graduate Faculty members to meetings of the Graduate Council and for calling into session the Graduate Faculty in cases where decisions of the Council are questioned.

Since this ad hoc committee is a two-man appointment, it is impossible to offer majority and minority reports; consequently, alternative recommendations are proposed. It is hoped that discussion on the floor of the Faculty Senate will indicate a preference for one or the other of the recommendations. The Chairman of the CCA, in case of an irreconcilable conflict of preference, is willing to go along with the second recommendation; and in formal discussion with his committee, he gathered a consensus of their approval of this position, if the occasion arises.

Peter H. Nash Geo. E. Osborne, Chairman