A. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the April 4 meeting were approved.

B. Campus Facilities Master Plan

L. Campbell joined the meeting. She shared the mission of the Campus Facilities Master Plan is to align buildings and spaces to the strategic plan. It will be a 10-year plan for capital improvement created over the next 12 months. There are four key considerations the Task Force will consider:
- good features not lost
- new features do not detract
- aging assets will be sustainable and flexible
- flexibility and adaptability in all spaces

A consultant/firm, not yet identified, will be hired. Representatives on the Task Force are expected to facilitate conversations in their areas. The Task Force has been asked to review the 2013 master plan and note items to remain, revise or update, and delete.

Currently, an engineering firm is conducting an inventory and conditioning assessment of all buildings on campus. This will be completed by the end of summer, in two rounds.

E. Saiff inquired who will receive the ultimate report from the Task Force. L. Campbell responded that was not clear.

The Deans weighed in on a few initial items, including: more classrooms with considerations of how teaching will be approached in the next 10 years, delivery modes, and classroom technology/media; more medium-sized meeting spaces; public-private partnerships for more social areas (restaurants, including those that serve alcohol, common spaces); the Adler Center, which the nursing program has outgrown; the Sharp Sustainability Center, which is currently underutilized; the Greenhouse classroom which is too small for teaching purposes; the Spirituality Center; the Admissions Office; the location of Health Services; accessibility in the Mansion and the bandshell; shared working spaces; the use of Linden Hall; the HVAC systems and past mold issues; and the implementation of RamaPRO and how many administrative units are working part or full-time remotely.

S. Gaulden shared that L. Campbell will be regularly invited to the Deans Council for updates. E. Saiff inquired about the composition of the committee. A. Lorenz expressed his hope that the master plan will emphasize flexibility.

C. Academic Program Reviews Schedule

S. Gaulden reviewed elements of the academic program process.
Self-study leads should suggest five potential reviewers to their Dean and Provost. At least one of the two external reviewers selected should have administrative experience (e.g., department chair, dean, etc.). It is best to avoid, when possible, utilizing reviewers from Ramapo’s direct competitors.

S. Hangen suggested revising the guidelines, given the changes in the practice over the last few years. These revisions could clarify commons questions, including utilizing data from databases such as IPEDS, the comparative study of other programs, requesting external reviewers’ consider the program in context of the College and overall structure, etc. S. Hangen will take the lead on revisions, E. Saiff will also contribute.

E. Saiff inquired if COPLAC could formally support program reviews with coordinating/volunteering reviewers from member institutions. S. Gaulden will inquire at the next meeting.

S. Gaulden noted that IR will be implementing Tableau over the next year which will create an interactive Fact Book. This will help the convening groups in gathering data in a timely manner.

D. Couzens inquired about replacing the individual kick-off meetings with one larger workshop; the Deans agreed and S. Gaulden noted the importance of having the entire convening group involved in the process.

D. Faculty Lines

The Deans briefly reviewed the published lecturer MOA on the ER website. S. Gaulden clarified a few items:
- lecturers may serve on search committees, except for committees for tenure-track faculty
- lecturers may not participate in All-College personnel committees
- lecturers may perform assessment and other service activities
- lecturers will teach three courses per semester
- lecturers will be expected to be on campus 3-4 days/week

S. Gaulden requested the Deans develop specific service assignments for hire letters. Job descriptions can be more general in the service requirements for the purposes of posting the positions. Examples of appropriate service activities were shared.

A. Lorenz inquired about the reappointment process. According the MOA, the first appointment is for one year. The following appointment may be either one or two years. The subsequent appointment may then be three years. Lecturers may also be appointed for one year appointments after the first initial one year appointment. S. Gaulden noted that more items need to be negotiated with AFT, including the content, process, and calendars for reappointment and promotion.

E. Petkus inquired about the next steps for posting and hiring. S. Gaulden responded job descriptions should be developed and search committees formed. Permission to search letters will be issued to the Deans.

P. Campbell asked if tenure-track lines will be searched in AY22-23. S. Gaulden responded she will discuss with President Jebb then discuss with the Deans individually. She is also in process of reviewing the program dashboards.

E. FY23 Budget

S. Gaulden thanked the Deans for their patience and assistance with building the budget. She thanked P. Campbell and his team for helping Scholars’ Day by printing the posters in house and
saving thousands of dollars.

F. ARC Proposals

S. Gaulden discussed the feedback received about her comments on approved ARC proposals. She shared information from her conversations with the ARC chair. E. Petkus shared his position that Deans and convening groups should review the syllabi, not ARC. S. Hangen responded that perhaps convening groups need additional training/guidance on this review. A. Lorenz agreed and noted that syllabi review is part of the professional responsibility of Deans and faculty. S. Hangen added that faculty are willing to do syllabi review; it was discussed during Unit Council. P. Campbell and E. Petkus agreed they also spoke with Unit Council. A. Lorenz and E. Saiff will have these conversations at Unit Council. P. Campbell suggested creating a calendar for syllabus review.

D. Couzens noted that ARC is in the process of revising the ARC manual.

G. Institutional Research Updates

The Council reviewed the executive summary of the IPEDS report as well as the interesting facts. Ramapo’s Carnegie classification has changed to larger programs. S. Gaulden noted that the College does not define its peer institutions; rather, IPEDS picks peers based on size, Carnegie classification, etc.

E. Saiff shared that University of Wisconsin Green Bay or Grand Valley was a model for Ramapo at its founding.

H. New Business

Admitted Students Day Update: C. Romano shared the current status of Admitted Students Day. Currently Admissions is 6% ahead in deposits compared to last year. He or A. Dovi will let the Deans know about the number of scholars registered for the end of the day receptions. He added that he spoke with FAEC about ways faculty can be involved in recruitment and converting acceptances to deposits, including personal phone calls and emails. E. Saiff noted that faculty should make phone calls from their college phone number. The priority deadline is May 1, C. Romano shared. Open House is on May 1 and over 600 students are currently registered.

PNP Next Steps: Cabinet has discussed the next steps. S. Gaulden shared the status of Academic Affairs’ proposals. iscussion at cabinet.

Summer courses: S. Gaulden reminded the Deans of the deadline to cancel under-enrolled adjunct-taught summer courses (April 28). A. Lorenz noted that since Spring final grades are due on May 16, the first day of Summer 1, there may be students who need to sign up in the short add/drop window.