

MINUTES

Ramapo College Board of Trustees

Deans' Council

Deans' Council

Thursday, February 20, 2020, 9:00 am - 11:00 am

AC 202

A. Approval of Minutes

The February 6 minutes will be revised and added to the March 5 meeting agenda for approval.

B. Budget: Deans Dashboard

Kirsten Loewrigkeit, Beth Walkley, and Alexia Mavros joined at 9:10am.

S. Gaulden referenced the budget survey, and explained that she and the Budget Office would like to learn what will be most helpful for the Deans when managing their budgets. K. Loewrigkeit, A. Mavros, and B. Walkley joined. K. Loewrigkeit thanked the Council for inviting them to present on the newly-developed Deans Dashboard in Adaptive. She noted that the Budget Office is a partner and a resource for all units; while the Office cannot make operational decisions, they can support decision-making through analysis.

A. Mavros presented the Deans Dashboard, which is still in progress. Deans can quickly reference the monthly Unit Report in the Dashboard. K. Loewrigkeit clarified that the Budget Office operates with negative assurance: if they do not hear questions or concerns, they assume the monthly report is being reviewed. L. Keller inquired if a Library dashboard can be developed; B. Walkley shared that Unit-specific Dashboards can be developed.

K. Loewrigkeit noted that, operationally, costs may shift within a unit and that is not an issue so long as there is no overall overspending. The shifting of costs will inform the following fiscal year's budget. B. Walkley noted that if costs due increase, there is not an issue so long as revenue also increases. K. Loewrigkeit also clarified that undergraduate tuition revenue is one "bucket;" undergraduate expenses may rise in one school, but Budget would expect to see a decrease of expenses in other schools with the assumption that if students are taking more classes in one area, they are not taking classes in another. P. Campbell noted that emergency staffing situations will impact a school's expenses. K. Loewrigkeit responded that if there is a paid leave and a need for class coverage, a Dean should alert her, the Provost, and the Budget Office if additional budget allocation is needed in those situations. The sooner in the year the Budget Office is notified, the better.

K. Loewrigkeit clarified that the Deans make operational decisions first and foremost to serve students. When this has a financial impact, the Budget Office should be informed. S. Gaulden added that the Deans will determine further customizations to the Dashboard.

C. Romano noted that it is possible to miss enrollment targets and still need additional class sections. E. Saiff added that in lower-level and developmental classes, the class size may be lower per policy. S. Gaulden noted that class scheduling is a different issue.

B. Walkley noted that if personnel expenses are exceeding the budget, the Deans should identify other sources in their unit to cover the overages.

E. Petkus inquired if the Budget Office could meet with the Deans individually; B. Walkley agreed and added each Dean could have a custom Dashboard. A. Mavros can provide training. K. Loewrigkeit again stressed the Budget Office as a partner, and that staff is available to attend meetings and take note of the financial implications.

C. Search Procedures

Nicole Morgan Agard and Marva Hawkins joined at 10am.

N. Morgan Agard and M. Hawkins noted that there have been questions about attending faculty candidates' teaching or research demos. N. Morgan Agard clarified that all members of the search committee must attend all demos of all candidates. If an administrator wishes to sit in, they must attend all demos of all candidates of a particular search. However, the preference is that the Hiring Manager should not be involved. If a Hiring Manager is able to sit in on one such search demos, they should sit in on all search demos. If faculty not on the search committee wish to attend demos, they may but they may not comment to the search committee.

N. Morgan Agard inquired if there are written evaluations for attendees to fill in. S. Hangen noted that there used to be evaluations, and they were utilized for faculty to provide feedback for those candidate presentations they were able to attend. D. Couzens inquired if there is a template evaluation. C. Romano shared there is a template evaluation in EMSA. The Deans shared there is no such template in Academic Affairs. M. Hawkins clarified that faculty need to be present at all demos if they wish to attend any. P. Campbell noted that is not the case or standard for students; there are different students in each demo. Additionally, informing faculty they cannot attend potential colleagues' presentations, particularly if they are in the same discipline, does not appear collegial.

N. Morgan Agard voiced there should be a consistent template evaluation; she and M. Hawkins will speak with HR.

S. Gaulden noted the two takeaways: the Deans/Provost should not piecemeal attend certain demos and not others, and there is a need to identify commonalities in evaluations to have a minimum set of parameters.

D. Fulbright "outreach lecturing fund"

Gaulden

S. Gaulden shared the information on the Fulbright Outreach Lecturing Fund. Visiting scholars can visit other campuses outside of a 75-mile radius of their home institution. It is an opportunity to further internationalize the curriculum, and can be used for the launch of new programs. D. Couzens will send the link with information to the Deans.

E. FYI: suggested Academic Planning Committee

Gaulden

D. Couzens recapped the proposed Academic Planning Committee. S. Gaulden shared it appears myopic to form such a committee. She also shared that on April 15, she will conduct a "new program proposal" workshop; details forthcoming.

E. Petkus shared that academic planning is faculty-driven. He agreed a committee should not be formed.

S. Gaulden added that it is important for faculty to understand how program proposals are vetted.

E. Saiff inquired if there is a way to better engage conveners in the topic, particularly on nurturing

interdisciplinarity. There may be underutilized resources that can assist with growing certain majors or rethinking certain programs.

S. Gaulden shared concern over the number of programs: for each new program, there is additional marketing, registration, assessment, and beyond. In addition to considering new programs, there needs to be consideration over programs that can be repackaged/rebranded and sunsetted. This will help the College avoid competing with itself.

P. Campbell expressed that feasibility is not under ARC's purview, and that an Academic Planning Committee could be a systematic way to demonstrate the faculty weigh-in on feasibility before programs go to ARC.

F. New Business

Faculty Handbook: The Deans discussed the Faculty Handbook Revision Task Force.

MSCHE: A question was brought up about the AFT posters in light of the MSCHE visit. D. Couzens will inquire.

3+1: C. Romano clarified that no agreements have been signed. There have been further exploratory meetings. A question arose about the NJ Transfer Law and Lampitt Law. All NJ community colleges must offer a 60-credit AA or AS degree. The laws mandate that these 60-credit AA or AS degrees must be one-half of a bachelor's degree. As Ramapo requested an exception to the recent legislation (that required all NJ senior public institutions grant bachelor degrees worth no more than 120 credits) that allowed it to maintain its 4-credit system, the College would have been out of compliance if it did not award 50% of a bachelor's degree to those students transferring in a 60-credit AA or AS degree. To be in compliance, 4 credits are awarded to NJ community college transfer students. In the 3+1 agreements, students will not receive the 4 credits as they will transfer an Advanced Associate's degree. S. Gaulden will send two emails as backup to the Deans.