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TO: President Edward D. Eddy

FROM: Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

1. The attached BILL, titled Report of the Research Policy and Facilities Committee: Establishment of a Biotechnology Center 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 March 21, 1985.

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

5. In accordance with Section 10, paragraph 4 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on April 11, 1985, 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 Governors for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Governors, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

March 22, 1985

Frank M. White
Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT

TO: Chairperson of the Faculty Senate

FROM: President of the University

Returned.

a. Approved 

b. Approved subject to final approval by Board of Governors

6/6/85

President

Form revised 10/83
In accordance with sections 8.90.20-22 of the University Manual, the Research Policy and Facilities Committee has reviewed the proposal to establish a Biotechnology Center at the University of Rhode Island and recommends approval by the Faculty Senate.

Attached is the proposal as revised on February 19, 1985 to accommodate concerns raised by the REPOFAC in its initial discussions. Appendix A is a memorandum of clarification from Dean Donovan to Assistant Vice President Swan and Appendix B is a memorandum from Vice President Ferrante reporting support by the Council of Deans for the proposed center.

Members of the Committee:
Jon Boothroyd, DEL
Dayle Joseph, NUR
John Long, EDC
Raymond Panzica, MCH
Arthur Rand, FSN
Akella Sastry, OCG

A. PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. Institution
   The University of Rhode Island

2. Department and College
   Initially the Center would involve the departments of Animal and Veterinary Science, Food Science and Technology, Nutrition and Dietetics, Plant Pathology/Entomology, Plant Science, and Resource Economics in the College of Resource Development.

3. Title of Program
   The Biotechnology Center

4. Academic Area
   Does not apply.

5. HEGIS Title and Classification Code Number
   Does not apply.

6. Intended Date of Implementation
   As soon as approved.

7. Anticipated Date for Granting First Degree
   Does not apply.

8. Intended Location of Program
   Kingston Campus

9. Institutional Review and Approval Process
   Approved by the Executive Council and faculty of the College of Resource Development.

10. Description of Organizational Unit
    The Biotechnology Center in the College of Resource Development is presently comprised of a group of faculty from various academic departments with common research interests. This interdisciplinary group is organized as a committee, four subgroups, an executive committee, and a chairperson. The initial subgroups are environmental, fermentation, food, plant and policy.

11. Resource Requirement
    No additional resources will be required to implement the proposed change. The College of Resource Development administration intends to gradually shift resources from low priority areas to this extremely high priority area to aid in its development within the involved academic departments.

Denotes additions to original proposal
I. Grades

The Academic Standards and Calendar Committee recommends that sections 8.33.10 and 8.33.11 of the University Manual be amended as follows:

A. Add the following to the list of defined grades in section 8.33.10:

- $^*$ -- Satisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option.
- $^*$ -- Unsatisfactory, course taken by a graduate student under the Pass-Fail grading option.

B. Add the following to the list of grades and quality points in section 8.33.11:

- $^*$ -- 0 points

Rationale: This change would conform University Manual language to current Graduate School usage. For a graduate student, a D grade is not a failure, it is unsatisfactory. Undergraduate students legitimately pass with a D grade.

II. Conditional Status

The Academic Standards and Calendar Committee recommends that section 8.25.13 of the University Manual be amended as proposed (changes are underlined):

**EXISTING**

8.25.13 At the end of the two conditional semesters, if the preceding minimum grade requirements have been met, the Scholastic Standing Committee shall direct the Registrar to examine the student's record prior to readmission and designate pass credits for those courses for which a grade of "C" or better was received. No credit shall be given in courses in which grades "D," "F," or "U" were received. While the permanent record shall continue to show previous grades, the calculations of the minimum number of quality points necessary for graduation shall be based on grades earned after the time of the conditional reinstatement.

**PROPOSED**

8.25.13 At the end of the two conditional semesters, if the preceding minimum grade requirements have been met, the Scholastic Standing Committee shall direct the Registrar to examine the student's record prior to readmission and designate pass credits for those courses for which a grade of "C" or better was received. No credit shall be given in courses in which grades "D," "F," or "U" were received. While the permanent record shall continue to show previous grades, the calculations of the minimum number of quality points necessary for graduation shall be based on grades earned after the time of the conditional reinstatement.

Members of the Committee:

Joan Clegg, PED
Leonard Gerber, FSN
Veronica Hanke, student
Lewis Hutton, LAN
Joseph Marasco, student
Paul McNamara, MSC
Richard Roughton, HIS, Chairperson
Christian Wittwer, THE
John F. Dedetoff, Registrar, ex officio
12. Signature of President

Dr. Edward D. Eddy

13. Person to be Contacted During the Review

Dr. Beverly Swan
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

B. RATIONALE

The University, and in particular the College of Resource Development, has many faculty engaged in research and teaching activities that relate directly to the subject matter area recently labeled BIOTECHNOLOGY.

Biotechnology, in very general terms, is the integration of basic and applied science for the modification of life forms, development of new biological systems, and the processing and conversion of materials of a biological nature.

In 1980 several scientists from the departments listed above got together and decided to coordinate their efforts for: 1) greater productivity; 2) more effective grantsmanship; and 3) greater identity. They requested that I create an interdisciplinary administrative unit within the college through which they could function, the purpose being to make the arrangement formal in order to increase visibility.

The group also applied for a portion of the higher education, high technology funds and was awarded $176,000 for equipment which was allocated to the appropriate department.

C. INSTITUTIONAL ROLE

The Center purpose is consistent with the University's interest in establishing areas of excellence through encouraging interdisciplinary efforts.

D. INTERINSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

No problems.

E. CONTENT

Does not apply.

F. EVALUATION

The University continually monitors and evaluates all such programs and administration units.
I understand that there is concern among some URI faculty outside the College of Resource Development (CRD) about the restrictiveness of our Biotechnology Center proposal. I would like to firmly state that we in the CRD fully understand that the present connotation of biotechnology is broader than the activities we have included in our proposal. In fact, we have already involved interested faculty from the Departments of Chemical Engineering and Microbiology, plus the College of Pharmacy. We welcome participation from any interested faculty. I would be disappointed to see our momentum and enthusiasm stifled because others feel excluded, or that we are stepping on their "turf." We had a good idea to enhance our interdepartmental research efforts in the biotechnology area and implemented it. Our efforts have been successful and we urgently need to maintain our momentum.

Our proposal is to create the Center and assure you it is not a "closed" unit. We are also amenable to whatever expansion will best serve the needs of CRD and URI faculty in general. The stronger the unit the more successful it will be in attracting outside funding.

GAD mhs

cc Dr. Traxler
    Dean Luzzi
    Dr. Rand
    Dr. Long