

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting Minutes
October 28, 2015
ASB: 007-008
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Attendees: Emma Rainforth, Rebecca Root, Renata Gangemi, Bonnie Blake, Ken McMurdy, Susan Kurzmann, Roark Atkinson, Susan Eisner

Excused Absences: Eva Ogens

Secretary: Mark Skowronski

Guests: None

- 1) Approval of FAEC minutes from October 21, 2015
 - a. Approved.
- 2) Library Renovations Working Group
 - a. A FAEC “library renovations” working group, responsible for proposing an official task force to Faculty Assembly (FA), is consistent with the agenda creation process in the bylaws.
 - i. Prof. Atkinson has already received several requests from faculty members across the college to join this working group.
 - b. The working group’s role is to draft the charge of a library renovations task force.
 - i. The charge will outline the rationale for the proposed task force—using a “fact finding” approach. The group will document what is already known (i.e., anecdotal reports and data already known to others on campus such as Provost Barnett and VP Romano) about problems with the physical structure of the George T. Potter Library and how our library compares with those at other colleges.
 - ii. The charge of the task force will outline membership requirements (e.g., faculty & librarians as voting members, students as non-voting members, ongoing consultation with administration).
 - iii. It was recommended that the working group review the charges of other recently formed task forces.
 - c. Timeline
 - i. The working group chair will send a draft of the charge to the FA President and Vice President by Nov. 4.
 - ii. The charge will be circulated among the members of the working group by Nov. 11. The working group (and library convening group) will likely meet the week of Nov. 11.
 - iii. The FAEC will discuss and vote on endorsing the charge on Nov. 18.
 - iv. The charge will be presented to and voted on by the FA on Dec. 2.
 - v. The task force will present FA with its final report by the end of the Spring 2016 semester.
 - d. President Rainforth will explore Provost funding for travel that may be necessary for this research.

- 3) Shared Governance Discussions with Provost Barnett
- a. Professors Rainforth and McMurdy met with Provost Barnett to discuss the Provost's concerns about the Shared Governance Subcommittee's Report.
 - i. The Provost is concerned about specific language calling for consultations in specific areas that might encroach upon AFT-negotiated managerial purview. The FAEC Shared Governance subcommittee this year will examine the "decision categories" and perhaps include an issue category appropriate for "non-binding consultation with faculty".
 - ii. FAEC acknowledges that there are different types of "shared governance." Classically, "consultation" is one of several types of participative decision-making and generally refers to a decision-maker asking for input/feedback before making the decision. Other forms of participative decision-making range from "collaboration," in which the decision-maker seeks to find consensus with others, to "empowerment/democratic decision-making" in which the decision-maker authorizes others to make the decision rather than the decision-maker.
 - iii. Different types of decisions may call for the use of different forms from amongst these decision-making types. In matching decision-making form to decision type, the goal is to optimize the decision's quality and its chance of successful implementation/buy-in. "Purview" of any decision-making party is a separate, though related, aspect of that choice. Decisions tend to be optimal when the decision-maker has full information when making a decision, and decisions are more likely to be implemented/accepted when there has been dialog before the decision regardless of what decision is made.
 - iv. It was suggested that "consultation," or whatever word is used to describe the expected model of decision-making, be defined. One member suggested that the word consultation be replaced with "decision making by informing relevant parties".
 - v. It was suggested that other models of shared governance be benchmarked and referenced.
 - vi. The Shared Governance Subcommittee wants to continue to involve the Provost in its discussions of process-related concerns (e.g., re: task forces).
 - vii. The Shared Governance Subcommittee will present a final report to FAEC and then FA by the end of this academic year.
 - b. Professor Rainforth is still waiting for the raw data used for Dean Chakrin's Financial Sustainability presentation.
 - i. Several FAEC members would like to see the recording of the presentation, so that faculty leadership is fully informed. Prof. Rainforth will explore options for viewing as a group.

- c. The FAEC is concerned that the Board of Trustees is not following its own procedures for soliciting faculty input (e.g., creation of centers/institutes). There are also concerns that the Board of Trustees and Institutional Advancement are bypassing the Provost in several areas of decision making that ultimately impact Academic Affairs.
 - d. The “constitutional” document being drafted by the Shared Governance Subcommittee should outline the appropriate level of communication and roles among the President’s cabinet. It should not be a document simply about the relationship between Faculty and the Provost. The subcommittee should consult with President Mercer on these issues and this aspect of this document at some point.
- 4) Report from George T. Potter Library – Re: Textbooks on Reserve
- a. The Library indicates that it does not object to keeping course textbook on reserve. However, there are some concerns about space and staff resource demands.
 - b. Due to copyright concerns, textbooks might have to be sent on a “semester-by-semester” basis.
 - c. Perhaps a pilot program could be run to test the logistics of this program.
 - d. There was some discussion about whether the bookstore can automatically send a desk copy to the library.
 - e. Textbook publishers might prohibit the use of instructors’ copies and e-text access.
 - f. The FAEC agreed to hold off discussions of this program at Unit Council until more information is provided by the Library.
- 5) Faculty Assembly Agenda for December (partial/subject to change).
- a. Presentation by Library Renovations Working Group. Vote on task force.
 - b. Presentations by FA President Nominees.
 - c. Gen Ed vote.
 - d. Collapsing of interdisciplinary convening group meeting times.
- 6) Upcoming FAEC Tasks
- a. Update from the Provost’s Rigor Task Force (FA may endorse but not approve recommendations from Provost’s task forces).
 - b. Update from the Task Force on Scheduling including status report on assessment of the current schedule.
 - c. Update from the Task Force on Service (this was requested at several prior FAEC meetings).
 - d. Invite the Vice President of Institutional Advancement to a FAEC meeting.
- 7) Announcements at Unit Council, Nov. 18
- a. Follow-up on the collapsing of interdisciplinary convening group meeting times.
 - i. Prof. Root will draft a mock meeting spring schedule and will send to FAEC members.
 - b. Announce that the FAEC has a working group on charging a library renovations task force. The charge will be voted on at FA (Dec. 2).
 - c. Dean survey will be ready before Nov.18 (all deans are surveyed, even if they are not up for reappointment). The Provost will attend the November

unit council meetings of TAS and SSHGS. Other schools that have expiring deans will poll faculty to see if there is interest in having the Provost attend December's unit council meetings.

- i. Prof. Root will send the FAEC members some standard language they may use to announce the poll to faculty.
 - d. Faculty interested in running for FA president should send nominations to the FA Secretary (Mark Skowronski, mskowron@ramapo.edu) by Nov. 25. These nominees will make a five minute presentation at FA (Dec. 2).
- 8) Other Items
- a. As reported in the Daily Digest ("policies in review"), the RF grade policy is different than the Course Repeat policy (see College Catalogue for specific details). Though neither type of course taken for a second time counts twice toward the 128 required credits, Repeated course grades (for a course retaken whose original grade was not an F) are averaged into the GPA while an RF course grade replaces the F earned the first time the course was taken. RF grades may occur twice per student; course repeats (those separate from RF) are limited to three in the major.
 - b. The Provost's Council is discussing a Posthumous Degree proposal.
 - c. Today's Gen Ed Forum (i.e., Faculty Forum) will be at 2pm in the Alumni Lounges.
 - d. Next week's FAEC will begin at 10:30 am.