

RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY
ACADEMIC REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC)

Special Meeting Minutes of
Monday & Tuesday, January 27-28, 2003
SAB Sanyo Conference Room (A-224)

January 27, 2003

Members present: S. Klein (SAB), Chair; Shalom Gorewitz (CA); R. Mentore (TAS); E. Risch (LIB); I. Spar (AIS); F. Shapiro-Skrobe (SSHIS); M. Ecker (Office of the Provost, ex-officio member)

The meeting convened at 10:15 A.M. The minutes of December 18, 2002 were approved.

This special ARC meeting was called to discuss a response to Provost Cody's memos to the faculty of December 9, 2002, and January 17, 2003. We spent the morning and afternoon in discussion of those proposals and the numerous individual faculty responses to them.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M. after agreeing to meet again the next day.

January 28, 2003

Members present: S. Klein (SAB), Chair; Shalom Gorewitz (CA); R. Mentore (TAS); E. Risch (LIB); I. Spar (AIS); F. Shapiro-Skrobe (SSHIS); M. Ecker (Office of the Provost, ex-officio member). Ira Spar (AIS) absent.

S. Klein called the meeting to order at 10 A.M. After an hour of additional discussion, the committee decided to compose a document to present and distribute at the special faculty assembly meeting scheduled for the next day (January 29). We did so, breaking down the proposals into six components, and suggesting that the faculty take the rest of the spring 2003 semester for discussion of alternate proposals (see attached document).

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Risch

TO: The Faculty Assembly
FROM: The Academic Review Committee (ARC)*
DATE: January 29, 2003
RE: ARC Position Statement on Provost Cody's Proposal

The ARC thanks Provost Cody for his proposal on *Course Load Adjustment, Culture Change, and Additional Comments*, dated December 9, 2002 and updated on January 17, 2003.

We support the goal of a reduced faculty teaching load. This is long overdue. Also, we recognize the increased pressures for high quality scholarship and teaching excellence that have been placed on all faculty, but especially on junior faculty, who also carry a full teaching load. The College needs to address these pressures in a fair and equitable manner.

The current proposal is multi-faceted, contains many components, and involves far-reaching changes in our curriculum, academic policies, and overall college culture. We believe that each of the components should be separated out, discussed, and evaluated on its own merits.

We understand the components of this proposal to be the following:

1. Reducing the annual teaching load from 8 to 7 courses.
2. Changing the college curriculum from a multi-credit to a standardized three-credit system.
3. Changing the responsibilities and compensation for conveners and instituting an assistant dean in each school.
4. Having some faculty continue to teach in a four-credit time slot while receiving three credits of compensation.
5. Reducing the graduation requirements from 128 to 120 credits.
6. Changing the ways that release-time credits are awarded.

Although the faculty have been presented with one plan to achieve the goal of reducing faculty teaching load, the members of ARC believe that other plans are feasible. We, therefore, respectfully request additional time for the convening groups and schools to consider the impact of the components of Provost Cody's proposal on their curriculum, faculty, and students, and to review alternative proposals. We recommend that such deliberations be completed by the end of the Spring 2003 semester.

* ARC Membership: Stephen Klein (SAB), Chair; Shalom Gorewitz (CA); Robert Mentore (TAS); Elaine Risch (LIB); Frances Shapiro-Skrobe (SSHIS); Ira Spar (AIS); Martha Ecker (Office of the Provost, ex-officio member)