



[Intranet](#) | [Faculty Assembly Home](#) | [Faculty Websites](#) | [Faculty Resources](#) | [Academics](#) | [Web for faculty updated 5/17/04](#)

ASEC Final Report May 17 -- Full Report

Preamble to Recommendations

This Report of the Academic Structure Exploratory Committee (ASEC), issued to the Ramapo College community on May 17, 2004, is the result of an intensive five month process—from January through May 2004—involving thorough review of and deep reflection on the current structure of the academic division.

Committee Charge

The committee charge from the provost and the Faculty Assembly leadership was "to recommend the most appropriate and cost-effective system for organizing the academic division." The committee was to address nine questions that focus on the configuration of academic units, the leadership of those units, and the placement of various programs within the proposed structure (Appendix A). The following reflections, commentary, and recommendations collectively represent the discharge of these responsibilities.

The committee comprised 14 total members, including eleven faculty members (two faculty representatives from each of the five schools, and one faculty member from the library), a professional staff representative, and two ex-officio members (administrative and professional staff). A measure of balance among faculty members and perspectives represented was struck by ensuring that the two faculty members elected from each school included one member with 10 or fewer years, and another member with 11 or more years, at the College (Appendix B).

Guiding Principles for Academic Reorganization

Academic reorganization is presumed to be desirable if it facilitates marked improvement in academic programs and ultimately the diffusion of excellence throughout the academic division. The College's Self-Study (December 1999), prepared for the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, more specifically emphasized that "any reorganization, if it does occur, should be based primarily on the principle of achieving optimal student learning, use of resources, and decision-making" (p. 92). Toward these ends, a restructuring that reconfigures organizational entities and re-specifies leadership authority and responsibility may be instrumental in strengthening academic communities, streamlining academic decisions, and fostering accountability. Put another way, *improved program quality, strengthened academic communities, streamlined academic decision making, and accountability for outcomes collectively represent a system of essential guiding principles that must serve as justification for and hence undergird any viable plan for restructuring the academic division.*

We recognize that reorganizations are rarely if ever perceived as necessary or desirable by many stakeholders likely to be impacted. *Nevertheless, our overriding obligation in working toward recommendations for academic restructuring has been to come to conclusions that, on balance, are best for the academic division as a whole and for the future of the institution in building and maintaining quality programs, and in attracting and serving prospective students.* This required that we consult with and balance the diverse and sometimes conflicting perspectives of a wide range of constituencies, such as students, deans, and faculty at large.

Brief Review of Process

Given the broad charge of the committee and the dynamic context surrounding committee deliberations, the timeframe within which we had to complete our work was, undeniably, exceedingly brief. Most notably, although the general education program (Gen Ed) and the course load adjustment plan (CLA) have been under discussion by the faculty well before ASEC was formed and charged, ASEC's deliberations concluded within the required five month period. This concentrated effort was necessary, as the process for any academic restructuring should commence prior to implementation of both Gen Ed and CLA.

Following is a summary of the many diverse analyses we conducted and activities in which we engaged as individuals, in small groups, and as a committee of the whole:

- We referred to relevant documents on strategic planning (e.g., The Strategic Plan for Ramapo College of New Jersey 2002-2012) and accreditation (e.g., Ramapo College Self-Study Report, December 1999).
- We reviewed relevant task force reports generated over the past few years.
- We considered historical perspectives on the College's structure.
- We requested and reviewed massive amounts of institutional information about and data on students, faculty, and programs.
- We examined the structure of colleges and universities both similar and dissimilar to our institution.
- We read all proposed models and thoughtful commentary posted to the ASEC webpage.
- We listened carefully to those who attended our student and faculty forums, and to deans and directors at lively panel discussions.
- We conversed with our colleagues on an ad hoc basis.
- We discussed emerging issues and committee processes at Faculty Assembly and unit council meetings.
- We analyzed input submitted by faculty at an in-service workshop.
- We conducted surveys completed by conveners and/or convening groups.
- We explored restructuring efforts of other institutions of higher education.

Ranking high in our considerations—if not uppermost in our minds—was the quality of the academic experience, level of responsiveness to prominent educational needs, and degree of orientation to long-term interests of current and prospective students at the College. Having traded ideas, discussed our own emerging viewpoints, and considered a spectrum of information, perspectives, and models, we worked progressively toward the interrelated recommendations included in this report.

Why Restructure?

A critical starting point for the committee's deliberations was analysis of the current academic structure. This could only be accomplished with an initial understanding of the structure, which unfortunately was not aptly articulated by any single source (person or document). Although we eventually uncovered many of the missing links, such as identifying most faculty members in convening groups, we were never able to grasp completely the academic structure. It appears that the structure has evolved largely unchecked over time: its effectiveness has declined as its confusing features have increased. *The lack of transparency and coherence were evident from the start of this investigative endeavor, and these aspects contributed to other structural weaknesses.*

From that point forward, recurring areas of concern factored highly into our recommendations:

1. Although students commonly express their identity at the College in terms of their major, they rarely identify strongly with either their major or school as academic communities, and they often tend to establish only weak bonds with faculty in convening groups. Schools do not necessarily serve as academic communities for faculty either. *There is a need to create stronger academic communities for students and faculty alike.*
2. Faculty members who serve relatively large numbers of students, or who participate in multiple convening groups, are especially torn between their responsibilities and allegiances to schools and programs, and among their responsibilities to the various convening groups they serve. Faculty members should not be forced to choose among the competing interests of their school and of multiple convening groups. *There is a need to set priorities for faculty responsibilities.*
3. Convening groups are lacking considerably in academic power (resources, decision making, and so on) as it is currently concentrated at higher levels and diffused among poorly-defined leadership positions. *There is a need to move resources and decision making down the organizational structure.*
4. The sheer number of convening groups has proliferated over time and is now relatively large (45+) given the number of full-time faculty (171), such that resources tend to be spread thinly and sometimes inequitably across these groups. Larger convening groups do not typically have the level of resources required to meet student and programmatic needs, nor do they appear to possess the leverage needed to access appropriate resources. Release time does not vary as widely as would be expected given the large differences in numbers of students served across convening groups. *There is a need to build into the structure a means for allocating resources equitably.*
5. Academic accountability is often laterally inconsistent (across conveners and convening groups) and may in some cases be vertically nonexistent (between convening groups and their respective schools). This compromises the ability of the institution to build and offer quality academic programs. *There is a need to establish a clear reporting structure.*

6. It is virtually impossible to clarify the precise roles and actual functions of convener and convening group in the overall academic structure, nor even identify precisely faculty membership in convening groups. Majors that are split between schools results in a further weakening of convening groups. These and other aspects of the current structure are opaque and confusing to students, external stakeholders, and even faculty, staff, and administrators. *There is a need to bring about structural transparency.*

Central to our concern, and related to several of the weaknesses cited above, is the longstanding scarcity of resources devoted to the academic division of the College. According to the Ramapo College Staffing Report (Spring, 2004), the number of full time faculty from 1975 to 2003 grew from 167 to 171, an increase of only 4 (2.4%), while the student population grew from 3,253 to 4,532 FTEs, an increase of 1,279 (39.3%). In this same period, Executive/Administration has grown from 30 to 72 (140%). Even more telling, adjunct faculty has increased from 0 to 216 in the same period. Such numbers clearly illustrate that the faculty collectively have been unable to access and utilize the level of resources that would allow for fulfillment of responsibilities in the most effective manner.

We suggest that aspects of the current structure—including a basic lack of faculty empowerment—have inhibited the ability of the academic division to focus on matters of strategic importance and to secure sufficient resources, from both internal and external sources, to support the academic endeavors of the College. Some of our recommendations are designed to help overcome perceived weaknesses in securing appropriate and equitable resources for academic programs.

Finally, other issues factored into our discussions, such as the identification of a broad range of perceived strengths and weaknesses associated with the current structure. Contributing to the complexity of our analysis was that what some persons perceived as strengths were sometimes perceived by others as weaknesses, and vice versa.

Fundamental Changes in the Academic Landscape

Considering the central issues identified above, and given the totality of our deliberations, *it became increasingly clear that the academic structure should be changed in some fundamental ways.* As profound as this may sound, modifying the structure in itself may have only a modest impact on the academic environment, including academic culture, processes, and outcomes. Restructuring must therefore be coordinated with the implementation of other decisions, such as the course load adjustment (CLA) plan. All activities associated with curricular modifications (in General Education, school cores, and majors) should be designed to dovetail with and support a reformulated structure. These decisions and endeavors collectively represent an entire configuration of emerging initiatives that are expected to result in significant improvements in the academic landscape. *It is therefore suggested that any and all structural change be reviewed and reassessed periodically as the College moves swiftly forward into uncharted territory.*

Partly in anticipation of this new landscape, and partly due to the explicit questions in our charge, our recommendations reflect seemingly inextricable relationships of critical importance—relationships between structure and curriculum delivery; structure and academic decision making; structure and academic leadership; structure and human resources; structure and financial resources; and structure and external considerations. Some of our recommendations may therefore need to be reviewed and/or approval by various stakeholders; for example, proposals for changes in the handling of personnel matters may require negotiations by the AFT.

What Our Recommendations Do Not Cover

Our recommendations do not deal with the role and structure of the Provost's Office per se, nor the relationship between academic structure and faculty governance. It could be argued, for example, that positions in the Provost's Office be reconfigured and consolidated, or that the faculty senate concept be considered as an alternative to the current all-faculty assembly approach to enhance faculty decision making at the college level. These issues are ripe for examination in light of the changing academic landscape.

The recommendations do not settle all important matters of organization, nomenclature, and reporting relationships. Partly due to the fact that no specific question concerning the library appeared in the committee charge, we conducted only a cursory review of structural issues pertaining to this unit. These issues will need to be revisited with greater attention to the library's relationship to other groupings in the academic division. Use of terminology such as "program," "center" vs. "institute," and "chair" vs. "director" vs. "dean," will need to be clarified further and should be consistently applied across the academic division and perhaps throughout the entire institution. This will assist in producing greater transparency both internally and to external stakeholders.

What Our Recommendations Do Not Suggest

Neither the specific recommendations in this report, nor the report taken in its entirety, call for or even suggest the elimination of any currently filled, permanent faculty position, or the elimination of any current degree program. The terms "restructuring," "reorganization," "aggregation," "reconstituted," "reconfigured," and the like as used in this report are meant to refer to the conceptual placement of persons and groups, or to the redefinition of positions and units, within a reformulated academic structure. The recommendations do not propose any specific placement of faculty members; placement issues will be dealt with in a separate process where further faculty input will be solicited.

Recommendations for Restructuring

Resulting from its extensive analysis of the current structure, ASEC has concluded that the academic division of the College needs a coherent, transparent, and stronger structure. We therefore propose the creation of a fundamentally sound academic structure that will foster a self-regulating system and more effectively serve students, faculty, and the College into the long-term future.

The committee's specific recommendations for academic reorganization are presented in three sections of this report:

- I. Empowering Front-Line Academic Groups and Reconfiguring Schools
- II. Defining Positions and Responsibilities of Academic Leadership
- III. Placing Other Organizational Entities and Specifying Reporting Relationships

The recommendations within and across these sections are linked: substantially modifying one particular recommendation would likely detract from the viability of others. In this sense, then, *the entire set of recommendations constitutes a re-structuring package; as such, we caution against treating specific recommendations as modular components.*

I. Empowering Front-Line Academic Groups and Reconfiguring Schools

Relevant Questions in Committee Charge

This section of the report deals with recommendations derived from the committee's deliberations on the following questions:

- What organizational entities would work best at Ramapo (schools, departments, programs, convening groups, etc.)?
- How many of these entities should there be, what shape should they take, what members should they have, and what criteria for membership should be established? Also, to what degree should the entities be either parallel or unique in structure, membership, number of programs, and other features?
- If we retain the current organizational model, should we combine convening groups, and if so in what way? Relatedly, should faculty members be limited in the number of groups to which they can belong?
- Should each degree major have only one academic home, rather than multiple homes as is sometimes the case in the current arrangement?

Recommendations & Rationale

The key academic entities should be:

- Programs consisting of reconstituted convening groups.
- Schools comprised of related programs.

Front-line academic groups should be empowered as reconstituted convening groups called "programs." Each program should be placed in one school. Each larger grouping of programs should retain the title of "school."

Recommendation IA: Role of Programs

Academic programs should represent the primary identification that students have within the institution. Compared with current convening groups, programs should have greater decision making authority and should be largely self-governing. Included within this greater decision making authority would be personnel recommendations (formal evaluation of peer faculty) and discretionary budget allocation. In return for this degree of autonomy, faculty in programs should collectively be responsible—and held accountable—for developing and reviewing courses, ensuring effective delivery of curricula, promoting academic rigor, maintaining academic standards, and working toward the achievement of student learning outcomes. Compared with current schools, programs would be substantially more cohesive and organic. A program's faculty would hold regular meetings to discuss and make decisions on an integrated set of issues that they care deeply about and can directly influence.

Rationale: Many students currently do not appear to identify strongly with either convening groups or

schools. The academic structure should relate to the student's curricular experience, and be designed so as to maximize responsiveness to student learning and related academic needs. Decisions should be made where they matter most—close to or at the level where the curriculum is designed, delivered, and monitored. This will result in strengthening substantially the role of programs as front-line entities and as the primary academic communities. It will also increase the likelihood of more effective delivery of curriculum and strengthened learning outcomes. More efficient use of scarce faculty resources may result.

Recommendation IB: Size, Configuration, and Number of Programs

Each program should be of sufficient threshold size to allow for appropriate decentralization of decision making from the school to program level, though programs may be home to varying numbers of permanent faculty. Programs should generally be larger in size and collectively fewer in number than current convening groups. Each program should house at least one undergraduate major and perhaps several related majors and/or minors.

Rationale: To as great a degree as possible, the academic structure should facilitate seamless movement of students from enrollment to entry into major of choice, and through their continued progress toward graduation. Programs should be of appropriate size for the following purposes:

- To serve students effectively.
- To support teaching activities.
- To build and sustain an infrastructure conducive to faculty research currently not available.
- To encourage innovative initiatives to emerge and be championed from within programs.

Programs should therefore form logically around shared curricular edges, i.e., where related or overlapping courses and curricula are taught among two or more convening groups. Combining convening groups would allow for:

- More efficient scheduling.
- Greater curricular synergy.
- More effective student advising, career planning, and preparation for graduate school.
- Better overall use of faculty resources in meeting student and institutional needs.
- More coherent personnel processes.

Aggregating convening groups (e.g., majors with other majors or minors with majors) into programs may result in more effective decision making concerning curriculum delivery and less conflicting activities among members (teaching responsibilities, service activities, and so on). This process should ultimately strengthen disciplinary programs, promote the development of interdisciplinary programs and other emergent curricula, and foster a dynamic relationship among and within programs.

Sufficiently large: Programs should, on the one hand, be sufficiently large to enhance sustainability/viability, and so that its members are empowered to make decisions rather than pushing

them up to higher levels by default. Greater leverage in decision making could occur in personnel (hiring, reappointment, tenure, promotion) recommendations, allocating operating budgets, and awarding research and travel funds. For example, personnel matters could be handled at the program level where faculty members are knowledgeable about the candidate's area of expertise, thus more qualified to participate in the recommendation process. Another example is in hiring tenure track faculty: a program consisting of an aggregation of majors and/or minors could conceivably hire a faculty member whose primary affiliation would be with that program, yet whose teaching responsibilities might span two or more of the major/minor curricula within the program itself. A third example is in allocating discretionary budgets: the larger the number of program faculty, the greater the flexibility in funding travel, research, and other faculty development activities.

Sufficiently small: Programs should, on the other hand, be sufficiently small for their leaders and members to remain focused on serving students and delivering the curriculum effectively, as opposed to becoming predominately administrative entities. This tradeoff must be carefully considered in the precise aggregation of current convening groups.

Aggregation where needed or desirable: Given the existence of 34 major and 12 minor convening groups with a tremendously wide range in numbers of faculty members and students served, some convening groups representing degree majors are presently of sufficient size to constitute programs. A great majority—approximately 70%—of all students choose one of 15 degree majors. Convening groups representing other majors and freestanding minors may be combined in some fashion so that they collectively represent a substantially smaller number of programs.

It is understood that convening group members may propose with which other convening group(s) they might voluntarily aggregate, though applicable criteria in justifying aggregated status should include academic relatedness/compatibility, course/faculty overlap, number of students served, recent patterns of growth and project growth, and overall program viability. It is also understood that programs may disaggregate and/or re-aggregate dynamically with appropriate justification and timing. This flexibility must be built into the structure so that changing student needs and interests can be met when deemed to be of sufficient magnitude and of long-term character. Finally, based on their academic interests, faculty may continue to self-organize into affinity groups for research, discussion, or other purposes.

In general, a move toward more decentralized decision making from schools to programs is expected to result in greater flexibility in meeting changing student and faculty needs, and greater impact on student outcomes and faculty productivity.

Recommendation IC: Home of Degree Majors

Each degree major should have one academic home, that is, it should be housed in a specific program. Each currently split major should be consolidated in one program within one school. No major should be offered or administered by more than one program at the College.

Rationale: Having one academic home for each degree major will provide greater transparency to and clearer identification for students, which in turn is expected to assist students in:

- Selecting a major.
- Knowing where to go for advisement.

- Establishing bonds with relevant faculty.
- Understanding and completing major requirements.

This will eliminate an important source of confusion for students and others, and its effectiveness will be enhanced in conjunction with faculty having a primary affiliation.

Recommendation ID: Faculty Membership and Role in Programs

Individual faculty should have one primary home (i.e., in a specific program), but may belong permanently or temporarily to a limited number (one or two) additional programs. Membership in programs should be based on the faculty member's core teaching responsibilities upon initial hiring, the bulk of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities in recent years, and otherwise the faculty member's academic qualifications and professional expertise. These criteria should be weighed, though faculty members will also have an opportunity to make a case for themselves; this opportunity will not be available to incoming faculty who will be assigned to a primary home.

The role of faculty in their primary home should include such responsibilities as:

- Teaching core and other courses.
- Advising students.
- Developing and approving the curriculum.
- Voting on personnel matters.

A clear description of responsibilities for faculty who also reside in secondary and tertiary homes should be developed. Newly hired and tenure-track faculty in particular must have a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and should not be expected to work through conflicting priorities.

Rationale: To preserve academic integrity, meet accreditation requirements, and respond appropriately to stakeholder demands, the institution must ensure that the curriculum is professionally and reliably delivered, and that students are otherwise well-served (e.g., through faculty advising).

Ensuring that faculty members have primary allegiance to one program will:

- Provide greater clarity to teaching and advising responsibilities and therefore enhance accountability.
- Facilitate curricular planning and clearer identification of needs for new faculty lines.
- Give increased attention to faculty research and scholarship.
- Enable students to identify readily the specific set of faculty members who are responsible for delivering reliably the curriculum.

- Encourage stronger bonds between faculty and student majors, such as by enhancing student advising and the potential for collaborative faculty-student research activities.
- Result in a transparent structure to internal constituencies, external stakeholders, and the general public.

As faculty members would likely perceive that more is at stake in their program than school assignment, their participation in decision making at the program level will take on much greater relevance and be more intimately related to their area of expertise than their current involvement at the school level. Participating in secondary and possibly tertiary programs will still enable interested faculty to contribute to other institutional needs if responsibilities to the home base are fulfilled. Due to expected faculty turnover and the addition of faculty lines, it is critical that new faculty members be given appropriate guidance in advance of fulfilling their responsibilities.

Recommendation IE: Role and Number of Schools

To be congruent with the goal of empowering front-line academic entities, schools in which programs are housed should be less curricular and more administrative (coordination, logistics, consistency, outreach, etc.) in character than they currently are. There should thus be a smaller number of reconfigured schools—perhaps three. Each school should house several academically related programs, though the number of programs housed in any school should be sufficiently small to promote efficient and effective communication and decision making between program chairs and the dean. Schools may encompass varying total numbers of faculty members and student majors. As decisions are decentralized to the program level, unit councils and unit committees would become increasingly less significant.

Rationale: Current decision making at the school level is sometimes divorced from those faculty who care most and are most affected. Many of these decisions could feasibly be moved from the school to program level. The number and configuration of programs will in large part determine the appropriate number of schools. As the number of convening groups would decrease substantially, the number of schools needed to administer programs would similarly shrink in number.

Recommendation IF: Faculty Membership in Schools

Individual faculty should belong to one school. School membership should be determined by the faculty member's primary home (i.e., the specific program with which s/he has primary affiliation). Responsibilities to the school, however, would be greatly reduced if not eliminated as faculty participation in decision making decentralizes to the program level.

Rationale: Faculty should continue to have membership in one school. The school assignment will be based on the faculty member's primary academic home, i.e., where the bulk of her/his responsibilities reside.

II. Defining Positions and Responsibilities of Academic Leadership

Relevant Questions in Committee Charge

This section focuses on recommendations reflecting the committee's deliberations on the following

questions:

- What leadership positions would work best (deans, associate deans, department heads, program chairs, conveners, etc.)? And what general responsibilities and level of authority should each have?
- How many such leadership positions should we have and what method(s) of selection should we establish?

Recommendations & Rationale

The key leadership positions should be:

- Chairs of programs.
- Deans of schools.

Recommendation IIA: Role and Number of Program Chairs

Compared with current conveners, program chairs should have greater authority in:

- Planning course offerings and scheduling teaching assignments.
- Approving flex/release time under the new Unit Plan.
- Making personnel recommendations.
- Allocating the program's discretionary budget to specific activities.

Chairs should in return be held accountable for program oversight, management, and assessment, including:

- Ensuring effective curriculum delivery.
- Building quality outcomes.
- Conducting thorough program reviews.

These front-line academic leaders should also coordinate advisement of students and mentor new faculty. Depending upon the size of the program they lead, chairs must be given release time under the new Unit Plan commensurate to their responsibilities. The number of program chairs should correspond to the number of academic programs (subsequent to the aggregation of convening groups).

Rationale: Granting greater authority with appropriate release time to program chairs will strengthen program development and enhance the probability that these leaders' increased responsibilities to faculty, students, and more broadly the institution will be fulfilled. Chairs will be effective advocates for their respective programs. The program chairs will collectively assist in balancing the responsibilities of leaders at all levels of the academic division, and will represent a proactive force for strengthening and reinforcing the academic environment.

Recommendation IIB: Selection and Term of Program Chairs

Chairs should be selected by program faculty. Terms should be of three years' duration, and chairs should be limited to two consecutive terms.

Rationale: Program faculty should be empowered to choose who will lead them and represent their group's interests in the greater academic community. Chairs must have appropriate levels of knowledge and experience, and be "of the faculty." As a greater number of faculty will typically be members of programs than are currently members of convening groups, program faculty will have a larger group from which to select a leader (i.e., greater potential choice). Precisely which faculty members would be eligible to vote for chair would need to be decided (faculty who have primary affiliation with the program? faculty for whom the program represents a secondary or tertiary home?). The position of chair should periodically circulate among faculty in the program.

Recommendation IIC: Role and Number of Deans

Deans should:

- Have a broad, visionary perspective.
- Undertake long-term planning efforts.
- Work to strengthen academic programs across the school and collectively at the institutional level.
- Engage in revenue generating/fundraising activities and other outreach endeavors critical in establishing mutually beneficial relationships with external partners.

Deans should also monitor the school's overall budget and supervise non-academic personnel. It is essential that deans be given the authority to make difficult decisions that may run counter to popular faculty opinion. The number of deans should correspond to the number of reconfigured schools, perhaps three (see Recommendation IE).

Rationale: Increasing the authority and responsibilities of front-line leaders (program chairs) will necessarily change the responsibilities of deans. Deans will have a more forward- and outward-looking orientation, and be responsible for pursuing revenue-generating activities (research funding, scholarships, endowments, etc.) currently engaged in by deans at competitor institutions. This will assist the academic division in building a stronger resource base to support and strengthen its programs. As stated in the 2002 Report of the Task Force for Finances of the Strategic Planning Committee, "the College needs to develop a mechanism that better links the Foundation's activities to the needs of individual units and faculty. These links may be used to further strengthen the relationship between the College and potential donors."

Recommendation IID: Selection and Term of Deans

Internal candidates should be groomed and promoted for deanship positions when such candidates are qualified and interested in applying. They should be encouraged to engage in developmental activities offered by professional academic administrative associations. Deans may be selected either from internal candidates or through national searches at the option of the faculty within the school. National searches should be required when only one qualified internal candidate applies. Deans should be appointed to renewable terms.

Rationale: Internal candidates who possess appropriate experience at the institution, and who are otherwise prepared to assume the post of deanship, should be given special consideration. Schools engaging in national searches may expand considerably their pool of highly qualified candidates. It should be decided whether deans selected through national search should be tenurable and undergo an accelerated (perhaps two year) process toward tenure. If external candidates were not allowed to be tenured or not provided with a sense as to whether they are likely to be tenured in the hiring process, they might not treat the opportunity seriously. Such an accelerated process might include initial review by the faculty in the program that most closely corresponds to the candidate's academic field of expertise. Whether hired from internal units or external institutions, deans should periodically be subject to evaluation.

III. Placing Other Organizational Entities and Specifying Reporting Relationships

Relevant Questions in Committee Charge

This section deals with recommendations resulting from the committee's deliberations on the following questions:

- Should the teacher education program be free-standing or remain part of another entity, and what title should its leader hold?
- Should the international education program be free-standing or part of another entity, and what title should its leader hold? What relationship should exist between the Roukema Center and other parts of the academic structure with respect to international education?
- Should graduate programs be placed in a separate unit, and if so what title should the leader of all the graduate programs hold?

Recommendations & Rationale

Certain academic areas or units with few or no permanent faculty members engage in activities requiring the "borrowing" of faculty and/or the coordination of course offerings in serving students across the spectrum of majors offered by the College. We were asked to evaluate three such curricular areas.

Our structural recommendations differ for:

- Teacher education
- International education
- Graduate education

Recommendation IIIA: Teacher Education

Teacher education should be a separate entity (center or institute) having appropriate resources and led by a director who sits on the Deans' Council.

Rationale: Teacher education attracts to the institution and serves a wide spectrum of students who

major in and support diverse academic fields and disciplines. As the program must meet strict external certification requirements, access to and coordination of in-house financial and human resources is necessary, keen attention to assessment and reporting of outcomes are required, and substantial outreach activities are essential. Because of the size, breadth and importance of the program, the director should participate in major academic and budgetary decisions. The head of teacher education should be a director and not a dean, however, as the overall responsibilities do not rise to the level of those envisioned for deans.

Recommendation IIIB: International Education

No separate School of International Education should exist. However, the International Studies major would continue to exist. The Roukema Center should be a freestanding entity serving the College at large, and led by a director who reports to a Vice Provost.

Rationale: International education should be infused into the curriculum as one of several "themes in teaching and learning" (Revised Mission Statement). This question should be resolved in the curriculum rather than through the structure.

Recommendation IIIC: Graduate Education

There should not be a separate graduate school to house graduate programs. The leader of all graduate programs should be Coordinator of Graduate Programs, and the leader of each program should be a director who reports to the appropriate dean.

Rationale: The institution's mission has traditionally been and remains undergraduate education; housing graduate programs in a separate unit might change the character of the institution beyond what is currently envisioned. Graduate programs tend to strengthen undergraduate majors and thus are best tied to and housed in academically related schools. A coordinator and/or graduate council is needed for administrative reasons (reporting, consistency, etc.). As the number of students enrolled in graduate programs is projected to grow considerably, the structure of graduate education may need to be reconsidered in the future.

Appendix A

ASEC Charge

GENERAL PURPOSE

This purpose of the Academic Structure Exploratory Committee (ASEC) is to recommend the most appropriate and cost-effective system for organizing the academic division. Put another way, if one could imagine the perfect academic organizational structure for this college, what would it look like?

The ASEC is being jointly charged by the provost and by the Faculty Assembly leadership. To arrive at its conclusions, the committee will solicit ideas from the faculty, develop its own ideas on the subject, analyze the implications of all proposals on the division (and also on the unit curriculum plan now being considered), and present its recommendations in a written report.

DELIVERABLE

A final report will be submitted to the provost, with copy to the Faculty Assembly president for

distribution to the faculty. A special Faculty Assembly meeting will be held during the In-Service Day in May 2004 to consider and respond to the ASEC report. The provost will discuss the report with the Provost Advisory Council (PAC) and with the faculty before deciding what, if any, recommendations he will make to the president.

WORK PERIOD

The committee will begin its work in late Fall 2003, meet intensively through the Winter 2004 session, and complete its work during the Spring 2004 semester.

MEMBERSHIP

The committee will comprise two tenured or tenure-track faculty elected from each of the five schools, one faculty member elected from the Library (because the Library has considerably fewer faculty than the schools), and one academic administrator designated by the provost--for a total of twelve members. As for the two members from each school, one must come from faculty with ten or fewer years at the college and the other from faculty with eleven or more years at the college (counting the current academic year). Committee members cannot be scheduled to teach Winter Session and must be available to meet the entire session. The committee will select its own chair.

COMPENSATION

The work of this committee is considered to be above and beyond what would be normally required of faculty, especially given the extensive meetings planned for Winter Session. Therefore, two hours of release time will be paid to each faculty member on the committee.

SOME QUESTIONS TO EXPLORE

In attempting to accomplish its purpose, the committee will consider the following questions, among others. Note that some questions could be considered subsets of others:

1. What organizational entities would work best at Ramapo (schools, departments, programs, convening groups, etc.)?
2. How many of these entities should there be, what shape should they take, what members should they have, and what criteria for membership should be established? Also, to what degree should the entities be either parallel or unique in structure, membership, number of programs, and other features?
3. What leadership positions would work best (deans, associate deans, department heads, program chairs, conveners, etc.)? And what general responsibilities and level of authority should each have?
4. How many such leadership positions should we have and what method(s) of selection should we establish?
5. If we retain the current organizational model, should we combine convening groups, and if so in what way? Relatedly, should faculty members be limited in the number of groups to which they can belong?

6. Should the teacher education program be free-standing or remain part of another entity, and what title should its leader hold?
7. Should the international education program be free-standing or part of another entity, and what title should its leader hold? What relationship should exist between the Roukema Center and other parts of the academic structure with respect to international education?
8. Should graduate programs be placed in a separate unit, and if so what title should the leader of all the graduate programs hold?
9. Should each degree major have only one academic home, rather than multiple homes as is sometimes the case in the current arrangement?

Appendix B

ASEC Membership

Rena Bacon, Theoretical and Applied Science (11+ years)

Carol Bowman*, Social Science and Human Services (10- years)

Joseph Cataliotti, Theoretical and Applied Science (10- years)

Martha Ecker, administration (ex-officio)

Michael Edelstein, Social Science and Human Services (11+ years)

Kai Fikentscher*, Contemporary Arts (10- years)

Ting Gong, American and International Studies (11+ years)

Teresa Hutchins, Administration and Business (11+ years)

Susan Kurzmann, Library

Brian Lofman*, Administration and Business (10- years)

Richard Morales-Wright, professional staff

Stephen Rice, American and International Studies (10- years)

Babette Varano, professional staff (ex-officio)

Warner Wada, Contemporary Arts (11+ years)

*Co-Chair.