1. Minutes for March 7 approved.

2. President’s Report

Pres. Morley feels the FAEC is making progress on its annual priorities, and is optimistic that we can effectively wrap up several issues (like faculty voice in deans’ evaluations) for the last FA of the semester, on April 18. He urged us to proceed with developing clear criteria for promotion to Full Professor. Rep. Risch noted that we must continue to engage the Strategic Planning Task Force (SPTF). By the end of the semester, we should more systematically assess progress on priorities and overall faculty governance. There are also a number of committee appointments to be made and elections to be held (such as for faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees).

To ensure a smooth transition between outgoing and incoming FAEC officers, we should invite the incoming FAEC officers to meet with us soon. Incoming FA President Weiss will also begin attending Pres. Morley’s meetings with President Mercer and Provost Barnett. The four of them will also go to dinner together once (in keeping with tradition).

The college has hired Urban Strategies, a company based in Toronto, to review use of space on campus and develop a plan next academic year. Apparently this group has already met with some parts of the administration and student body, and they recently made a presentation to the SPTF. The Steering Committee overseeing this does not currently include any faculty representatives, but has asked for one.

Decision: After some discussion, it was agreed that Pres. Morley will inquire as to whether Prof. Joe Cataliotti might be willing to serve in this capacity. He serves on the current Space Committee and is very well versed in these issues. Pres. Morley will also express to him the necessity of this new Steering Committee and the current Space Committee working together.

3. Deans’ Evaluations

Reviewed the discussion from the last FAEC as to ways to increase faculty voice in the evaluation/reappointment of deans. After much discussion, the FAEC reached consensus that the preferred option for now is to develop additional questions to be added to the survey currently used by the Provost’s Office. The results of these additional questions would be available to the faculty in the unit. The purpose of this exercise is threefold: 1) to give the Provost more useful faculty feedback, 2) to give the dean in question useful feedback that can be used to improve leadership and management of the unit, and 3) to
give the faculty of the unit some sense of the opinion of the unit. (This latter point might be particularly relevant if, for example, the Provost decided not to reappoint a dean despite high scores from faculty, or to reappoint a dean with low scores from faculty. That might be useful information in a conversation with the dean and Provost about that decision.)

**Decision:** The questions should be based on input from the faculty. Agreed to include both a decision item and a discussion item on this topic in the agenda for the next FA. (See next section of minutes.) In advance of that FA, Pres. Morley will send out an agenda, a copy of the current survey instrument for deans’ evaluations, and a request that faculty bring potential questions to add to it to the next FA.

Discussed what kind of data (quantitative scores alone, or comments as well) should be available to unit faculty. Discussed how to raise the issue with deans and whether to solicit their input into the questions to include.

4. Agenda for the March 28 Faculty Assembly

a. President Morley’s Report, including a moment of silence for Prof. Anita Brandolini

b. Provost will give report

c. ARC decision item presented by Chair Emma Rainforth

d. Brief report from Prof. Jason Hecht on progress of FA Budget Committee

e. Union report by AFT Local Pres. Irene Kutchta

f. Motion to move to closed session

g. Pres. Morley will explain the issue of faculty voice in deans’ evaluations and briefly review the current survey. He will explain that faculty would be able to see the responses to any questions we add. He will have distributed the current survey instrument in advance and encouraged faculty to bring suggested questions with them to this FA.

h. Decision item: Should the FAEC draft a short list of additional questions to add to the current survey for deans’ evaluation based on input from Faculty Assembly and to be voted upon at the next FA?

e. Discussion item: Generating ideas about possible revisions to current survey for deans’ evaluations.

f. New business

5. Meeting with ARC Chair, Prof. Emma Rainforth
Prof. Rainforth joined us briefly to explain the decision item she will be bringing to the next FA, dealing with approval of a major in Medical Imaging Sciences. Because this is technically a new program, it requires FA approval, however she noted that in practice this is simply renaming a program that already exists. The program is part of an articulation agreement between Ramapo and Allied Health Technologies for students acquiring technical training. The program has already been approved by the state.

6. Other Business

Rep. Crawley reported that the FA Budget Committee met with Pres. Mercer and Assoc. Vice President of Budget and Fiscal Planning Maria Krupin, who is making lots of data available to the committee. VP Krupin is helping Prof. Hecht make sense of that data before the rest of the committee wades in.

Rep. Mustafa reported that the SBR Task Force is waiting for Provost Barnett and AFT Local Pres. Kutcha to approve the new guidelines the Task Force has developed. He will circulate those guidelines (“regs”) to the FAEC today. The goal is to be able to put them up for faculty approval at the April 18 FA.

Rep. Crawley will give a brief report to the April 18 FA about the status of online student evaluations.

Pres. Morley reported that the Board of Trustees has set aside funds for the Academic Commons, and that other sources of funding are being pursued. Pres. Morley will charge the faculty representative to the new Steering Committee dealing with space issues to represent the interests of the faculty on this project there.

Rep. Goldberg raised the issue that some changes to the Faculty Handbook are being contemplated or made by Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Budget & Personnel/Employee Relations and Ethics Officer Judith Jeney and AFT Local Pres. Kutcha. For example, for tenure and promotion packets, in future letters of internal support (i.e. from Ramapo colleagues) cannot be solicited by the candidate, but rather must be solicited by the Unit Personnel Committee. Does the FA have any say in this or any other changes to the Faculty Handbook? There is a union meeting today, so someone should ask.