

**RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY
ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC)**

Meeting Minutes of
Wednesday, November 16, 2005
11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.
SB Sanyo Conference Room (A-224)

ARC Members present: S. Klein (SB), Chair; S. Kurzmann (LIB); J. Lipkin (CA); R. Mentore (TAS); Shapiro-Skrobe (SSHS); I. Spar (AIS); M. Ecker, (Office of the Provost, ex-officio member)

After the meeting was called to order at 11:00 A.M, the minutes of November 7, 2005 were approved with minor revisions.

-

Discussion Items

Meeting with the Directors of Graduate Programs:

Prior to a meeting with past and present Directors of the College's Graduate Programs, ARC members discussed its proposed Program Proposal Review and Approval Process for Graduate Programs and Courses. A joint meeting then commenced with the Graduate Program Directors (K. Burke, A. Cristini, A. Padovano, and A. Stellenwerf). Discussion ensued with regard to the four resolutions included in the proposal. Specific discussion centered on the groups designated to review program proposals and the order of their review. It was agreed that specific input on the type of review and place of that review in the process still needs to be defined by the Office of the Provost.

-

Experiential Component in All Curriculum Enhancement Plan (CEP) Courses:

The ARC endorsed, in principle, the proposed *Memorandum of Understanding* agreement of the Administration, Faculty Assembly, and the AFT local of Ramapo College regarding the experiential component in all Curriculum Enhancement Plan (CEP) courses. Specifically, the *Memorandum of Understanding* states "that each course will have five (5) hours of unmonitored appropriate experience outside of the classroom over the period of the semester. These experiences, which enhance student learning, could include visits to museums, guest lectures, library programs, colloquia, assigned TV show movies, participation in class projects, service learning, convocations, trips to professional meetings, and wide range of other activities limited only by the creativity of our faculty and students."

-

-

Decision Items:

Course Request:

ARC Request #201 CEP Intercultural North America Category

(SOSC) MMET 209 *Ideology and Film* (M. Kahn) course was approved for inclusion in the CEP Intercultural North America Category.

Proposed Resolutions:**ARC Request #202****Graduate Program Review and Recommendation and Graduate Course Review and Approval Processes and Procedures:**

In order to provide a more effective process and procedure for undergraduate and graduate review, the Academic Review Committee (ARC) meeting with the Graduate Directors reached unanimity on the following four resolutions. ARC will request that the Faculty Assembly approve the following resolutions at its next meeting..

Resolution I**I. Program Proposal Review and Approval Process**

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) recommends that all proposals for both graduate and undergraduate programs undergo the same review and approval process and procedure as articulated in the *ARC Program Proposal Review and Approval Process, 1/2004*. Please note that this document is undergoing change because of the Curriculum Enhancement Plan (CEP).

Listed below are the groups that would review program proposals:

- Graduate Program Directors' Group (GPDG) (if it is a graduate program)
- Convening Group (or group of interested faculty, if no related convening group exists) (CG)
- Dean
- Unit Curriculum Committee (UCC) (for units that have such a committee)
- Unit Council (UC)
- Academic Review Committee (ARC)
- Faculty Assembly (FA)
- Deans Council (DC)
- Office of the Provost
- President

Resolution II**II. Program Pre-Proposal Step**

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) recommends that there be a pre-proposal step for any new program proposal, whether at the undergraduate or graduate level, to ensure that the program satisfies the following criteria:

1. It is consistent and appropriate with the mission of the College and the School.
2. It is consistent with the mission of the College and the School, as defined by the State of New Jersey Commission on Higher Education.
3. An analysis of the resources needed to make the program viable has concluded that the program is feasible in terms of resources and impact on other existing programs.
4. An analysis has been done indicating the level of likely interest among existing students (or potential students) in the particular program

The group making the program proposal shall prepare a 1-3 page narrative briefly describing the proposed program and its goals, providing the results of the resource and student analyses, and stating how the program satisfies the above criteria. That pre-proposal narrative is to be submitted to the Provost for his/her comment. The Provost's comments will then be added to the packet as it makes its way through the remainder of the review and approval process. Note the Provost's input at this stage is commentary only; it is not a yes-or-no recommendation step, as that will occur much later in the process.

Resolution III

III. Graduate Program Five-Year Reviews

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) recommends that graduate programs undergo five-year reviews. The graduate program director shall conduct the five-year review process and work with the Office of the Provost and school deans to design the review process, using the undergraduate process as a model.

Resolution IV

IV. Course Review and Approval Process

The Academic Review Committee (ARC) recommends that the review and approval of all course requests, whether at the undergraduate or graduate level, follow the same procedure, as articulated in the *ARC Course Review and Approval Process, 2/2005*. Please note that this document is undergoing change because of the Curriculum Enhancement Plan (CEP).

Listed below are the groups that would review courses:

- Convening Group (CG) (if there is one)
- Graduate Program Director (GPD) (if it is a graduate course)
- Graduate Program Directors' Group (GPDG) (if it is a graduate course)
- Dean
- Unit Curriculum Committee (UCC) (for units that have such a committee)
- Academic Review Committee (ARC)
- Office of the Provost

The signatures of the convener and dean are needed before undergraduate course requests are sent to ARC. Signatures of the graduate program director, the head of the Graduate Program Directors' Group, and the dean are needed before graduate-level course requests are sent to ARC.

The principles of transparency, collegial discussion and collaboration will govern the processes.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ira Spar