

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting Minutes
September 29, 2016
SSHGS Conference Room
10:00am to 12:00pm

Attendees: Roark Atkinson, Renata Gangemi, Tae Kwak, Christina Connor, Cristina Perez, Gladys Torres-Baumgarten, Kathryn Zeno, Eva Ogens

Excused Absence: Kim Lorber

Secretary: Mark Skowronski

Guests: Dean's Council (Provost Barnett, Vice Provost Daffron, Dean Rice, Dean Perry, Dean Saiff, Dean Petkus, Library Dean Liz Siecke)

- 1) Approval of FAEC minutes from September 21, 2016
 - a. Approved.

- 2) Gen Ed Implementation Discussion with Dean's Council
 - a. Provost Barnett has approved GECCo's plan to delay review/approval of distribution courses until next semester. The Board of Trustees has indicated its willingness to consider a full delay of the new Gen Ed program if GECCo's workload (based on the volume of applications it receives) is unworkable. The Provost remains concerned about having sufficient data in time for *Middle States'* visit.
 - i. Vice Provost Daffron: *Middle States* will likely visit Ramapo during the 2019-20 AY. In preparation of this visit, a self-study team will need to be assembled (approximately) in Spring, 2018, which will submit a final report in Fall, 2019. The visit is likely to occur in Spring, 2020. Ramapo will also need to submit a "pre-report" early in the reaccreditation process.
 - ii. Prof. Kwak expressed his concern about the complexity of the implementation process. There are many variables that may affect ARC and GECCo's ability to review/approve courses, some of which are difficult to predict. For example, it is possible that GECCo may receive too many or too few courses to review.
 1. GECCo has communicated to Prof. Kwak its willingness to assess four categories per semester (rather than two) if we delay full implementation until next year.
 2. The Provost is concerned about the coherence of the program and what it will do to students if we delay full implementation for another year.
 1. Prof. Kwak shares the Provost's concern. However, he is worried about the coherence with the current plan for a staggered rollout
 - iii. Current time constraints.

1. The current implementation timeline does not appear to provide faculty with much time for making GECCo/ARC revisions.
 - a. The registrar should expect to receive some courses later than its usual deadlines (for the Fall, 2017 schedule). The registrar needs ARC approval before assigning a CRN.
 2. It also appears to leave little time for GECCo/ARC to consult with convening groups to ensure content rigor.
 3. It is unclear if GECCo has been given executive direction about being conservative with the courses it accepts (so such courses will not have to be removed from Gen Ed at a later date).
- b. Dean Rice: What is the role of the Deans in approving Gen Ed courses? Provost Barnett: The Dean does not determine the “Gen Ed-ness” of a course (that’s GECCo’s role). Rather, the Dean decides if a faculty member can be scheduled to teach that course.
- i. Dean Saiff: Faculty should think about whether a course will have enrollment if approved.
- c. Faculty Anxiety
- i. The Faculty is anxious about the rushed implementation timeline and the lack of contingency planning.
 - ii. Also, there are concerns about managing the transfer students that will need substitutions for Gen Ed distribution courses next year.
 1. Provost Barnett and Vice Provost Daffron have assured the FAEC that there will be planned, pre-approved substitution courses. Paperwork will be distributed to faculty advisers outlining these pre-authorized substitutions.
- d. Oct. 15 (the GECCo/ARC deadline) is a Saturday. When should faculty submit proposals? Provost Barnett: Monday (however, Friday is recommended).
- e. Dean Saiff proposes another meeting between Dean’s Council and the FAEC if ARC encounters problems after Oct. 15.
- 3) FAEC Gen Ed Implementation Discussion
- a. The FAEC is concerned that the rushed implementation process may lead to “rubber stamping” of courses with minimal quality control.
 - b. Although courses for Fall, 2017 would generally need to be scheduled by the end of October, the registrar may have the ability to accept courses through January (January appear to be a hard deadline -- there is a need to clarify this).
 - c. Assessments appear to be driving the implementation of the Gen Ed program. This concerns the FAEC.
 - d. Will there ever be an assessment at the course level (or are we just assessing categories)? It would be helpful for the Vice Provost to provide some clarity on this issue.
 - e. The FAEC would like a representative from *Middle States* to come and talk about how assessment activities (that have been accepted by *Middle States*) are conducted at other institutions. The FAEC would also like to know at what level of detail *Middle States* reviews a school’s assessment activities.