

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting Minutes**  
**March 9, 2015**  
**ASB 230**  
**9:20 AM to 11:00 AM**

**Attendees:** Emma Rainforth, Rebecca Root, Ken McMurdy, Eva Ogens, Susan Kurzmann, Roark Atkinson, Susan Eisner, Bonnie Blake, Jonathan Lipkin

**Secretary:** Mark Skowronski

**Guests:** President Peter Mercer, Provost Beth Barnett

- 1) Approval of FAEC minutes from March 2, 2016
  - a. Approved
  
- 2) President Rainforth's Report
  - a. Update from President's Advisory Council (PAC): 1) a subgroup is working on a values statement for the College; 2) Ramapo expects to receive a financial update from the State in late April, early May (State budget indicates no increases or cuts to higher education); 3) the proposed agenda for April's PAC meeting includes faculty/staff training needs.
    - i. Several members of the FAEC believe that an assessment of the PAC council is warranted. Has the council assessed its effectiveness? The goal of council was to increase communication across the College community; does this seem to be happening?
    - ii. Possible faculty/staff training needs include (for example) Title IX, microaggressions, managing emergencies
  
- 3) Unit Council Updates
  - a. SSHGS rep: The majority of the SSHGS faculty is involved in GEIT working groups. Many of these individuals are unhappy with the GEIT process--believing that the process is too "top down". There are many issues (e.g., caps, timelines, outcomes) that create shared governance concerns, and there is a general lack of trust with the administration (including the Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment). Several SSHGS working group members have suggested that the Vice Provost step down from the leadership of GEIT and be replaced with a faculty member. There were also many criticisms from SSGHS of the FAEC's perceived surrendering to the administration on these issues. The SSGHS rep would like the FAEC to do more to deal with these concerns and restore trust.

- b. SSHS rep: SSHS is upset that the assessment cycle is three years and that Outcomes cannot be changed until after the cycle ends. Many feel that they were led to believe that there would be some flexibility with the Outcomes.
  - c. President Rainforth's response: The GEIT Steering committee is not a decision-making body. ARC, GECCo, and convening groups will have decision-making authority over courses. There has to be a structure in place for assessing the Gen Ed program (as assessment is necessary for accreditation).
- 4) Other Items
- a. FAEC reps who will begin their terms in September 2016 will be invited to observe a FAEC meeting at the end of the current semester. This was requested by several members-elect.
  - b. The FAEC approves the proposed MS in Accounting.
  - c. The FA secretary received another nomination for the at-large FAEC (under 11) councilor seat.
  - d. There will be a Faculty Forum on March 23. The topic will be Gen Ed implementation.
- 5) Guest: Provost Beth Barnett
- a. Provost Barnett informed the FAEC that the first meeting with the external search consultant (for the ASB dean search) will occur this Friday. No specific date at this time has been set for posting the position; although when posted, it will be open to both internal and external candidates.
  - b. Prof. Rainforth expressed the FAEC's concern that certain administrators do not seem to respect policies and procedures (e.g., teaching load policy). The Provost responded by reaffirming that the proposed MSN program should have been stopped after the feasibility study. She reassured the FAEC that she will not approve the hiring of full-time graduate faculty. When asked about the language of the revised teaching load policy, Provost Barnett indicated that this issue will be discussed at tomorrow's Deans' Council.
  - c. The FAEC rep for SSHGS shared with the Provost her unit's concerns and complaints with the Gen Ed implementation process (see above) and timeline.
    - i. Provost Barnett responded by reiterating the importance of a Fall 2017 implementation date. If we wait until Fall 2018, it will be almost impossible, in her view, to assess loop-closing activities of the old Gen

Ed. If we implement Gen Ed in Fall 2017, we will have some data from the new program.

- 6) Guest: President Peter Mercer
- a. President Mercer was asked about the brevity (lack of detail) of the Board of Trustees's meeting minutes. He will inquire.
  - b. The FAEC rep for SSHGS shared with President Mercer her unit's concerns and complaints with the Gen Ed implementation process (see above) and shared governance concerns.
    - i. The Provost reiterated that the number of courses in a Gen Ed category is a matter of scheduling. Scheduling decisions are within the purview of the administration.
    - ii. ASB FAEC rep: Perhaps deans need a formal charge to talk to their faculty to get a sense of where their units are. Also, there needs to be consultation with faculty (even on issues of managerial purview) on implementation issues (such as the setting of caps).
    - iii. President Mercer: Some of the resistance with implementing Gen Ed may be coming from people who are unhappy that a new Gen Ed was approved.

**Gen Ed Implementation Team (GEIT) Governance Committee - Meeting Minutes  
March 9, 2015  
ASB 230  
11:00 AM to 12:00 PM**

**Attendees:** Members of the FAEC (see above) and members of Dean's Council  
**Secretary:** Mark Skowronski

- 1) The GEIT governance committee reviewed revisions made to the GEIT governance document.
- 2) There was a discussion about the need to manage the old and new Gen Ed programs concurrently. Are different committees necessary (e.g., GECCo1 and GECCo2)? Alternatively, we can retain one GECCo committee as there will be less assessment of the old Gen Ed program (there are ways of combining some areas of assessment of the old and new Gen Ed).
- 3) The FAEC expressed the faculty's concerns about the administration's timeline for Gen Ed implementation. The Vice Provost for Curriculum and Assessment suggested that the process might be extended into May and

June. He also indicated that the timeline will be discussed at this afternoon's GEIT Steering Committee meeting.

- 4) The GEIT Governance Committee discussed the membership of the new GECCo. If there is a clear home (i.e., unit) for a Gen Ed category, that unit will select that coordinator that sits on the new GECCo. If the category does not clearly belong to a unit, the coordinator will be an at-large position. The FAEC reminded Deans' Council that any changes to GECCo's membership will have to be approved by FA as GECCo is a FA body.
  - i. There was a discussion about the criteria for serving on the new GECCo. Individuals should have some relationship to the courses in the category they are representing. These individuals should also have some leadership abilities. The Provost believes that there should be some consultation with the deans before elections (to ensure that the individual is at an appropriate level and fulfilling their current duties).
- 5) The FAEC rep for SSHGS shared with the GEIT Governance Committee her unit's concerns and complaints with the Gen Ed implementation process (see above). Specifically, many faculty are finding it difficult to make recommendations without feeling that they have some control over timelines and caps (and other implementation issues).
  - i. The Provost responded by distinguishing curricular decisions from scheduling/assessment decisions. Decisions about the number of courses in a cap is, in the Provost's opinion, an assessment/scheduling issue. She also indicated that the administration is awaiting data to inform the setting of caps.
  - ii. The Provost acknowledges that she cannot change the terms of the new Gen Ed without Faculty Assembly approval.
- 6) The deans were asked to provide their input on the Gen Ed implementation process. Of the deans that were in attendance, only the SSHS Dean expressed any concerns. Specifically, he reiterated his faculty's need to feel that they are having a say in the implementation of the new Gen Ed.
- 7) The Provost clarified that the Gen Ed Steering Committee is not a decision-making body. The role of the Steering Committee is coordination.
- 8) Assessment of the Gen Ed program, per Middle States requirements, is programmatic assessment, not student assessment (or longitudinal cohort assessment).

- 9) President Rainforth: Perhaps we can allocate time on March 30 for working groups to meet with the faculty.