FCCC Plenary – Draft

Minutes from the Fall 2008 Plenary Meeting of FCCC

The Faculty Council of Committee Colleges (FCCC) met at Westchester Community College on October 16th – October 18th.

Thursday, October 16, 2008

New Delegates Meeting

1. An overview of FCCC function was lead by M. Johnson and K. Reiser. They shared their views of the role of a delegate.
2. A discussion of the duties of a delegate was lead by J Halsey and S. Richman.
3. The roles and initiatives of each standing committee was presented by the chairs of that committee.
4. A. Catalano discussed the FCCC Website and listserves.

Call to Order

President Johnson called the meeting to order. He welcomed the delegates and explained the changes to the agenda. The new delegates and the System liaisons were introduced. I. Cook provided plenary information. The delegates attended committee meetings.

Address by Provost Risa Palm to the Delegates

After dinner on 10/16, Provost Risa Palm presented a update from Academic Affairs to the delegates. The following was presented or discussed.

1. R. Palm stated that the budget is the most serious issue facing SUNY at the moment. She stated that there was a huge decrease in funding for public education and increase demand for higher education. She felt that we were losing the ability to develop intellectual capital. She believes that private higher education has benefited from increased endowments and tuition. R. Palm pointed out that faculty salaries have not kept up and to keep up with student demand there is an increase in the use of adjunct faculty. As a result, there are problems with low cost public education, which currently serves ¾ of all students in higher education. She feels that private institutions cannot serve the mission of the public community. “We cannot turn education over to private enterprise.” She felt that we need to focus on access to a quality higher education system, economic and civic development and high quality education. She wondered how can we get through this crisis and stated that we need to be patient and look to the future. She felt that if we act wisely and together, we can come out stronger. She encouraged us to continue to tell our story and felt that System needs continued conversations with faculty.

2. Questions
   a. S. St John Jarvis asked if SUNY should help high school students decide what they want to do. R. Palm responded that is is the mission of the community college to admit students that are exploring.
   b. K. Reiser asked the Provost to comment on her vision for SUNY given the current budget constraints. R. Palm responded that she wanted us to act more like a system, to have seamless transfer, to foster collaboration between state operated campuses and the community colleges. She would like to increase the quality of SUNY through more collaboration between faculty. She would like to increase international studies in order to educate the students of NYS to compete globally. To do this, we need to teach our students more about other cultures.
   c. K. Reiser asked about general education and the resolution developed by the Joint
Committee. She stated that we want the resolution to be embraced by the Board. She also asked about the package that will be presented to BoT and for clarification about the statement that students will need to complete 10 out of the 10 general education silos prior to transfer. R. Palm responded that if students are planning to transfer, they should complete all 10 silos before transferring and before beginning work in the major. She stated that if FCCC and UFS both fail to pass the resolution by the Joint Committee, the Board will come up with language for resolution. She stated that she cannot imagine a resolution that requires the community college students to complete all 10 silos prior to transfer.

d. S. Richman stated that freshman and sophomore years should be years for exploration. R. Palm replied that if students have to complete general education in junior and senior years then they cannot do work in major. She felt that the general education requirement is an old fashion idea; it does not allow mastery level depth. Vice Chancellor Golladay suggested that we should look at general education.

e. D. Golladay stated that the BoT will not look at general education requirements at this moment. He also felt that the general education package is inappropriate and old fashion. He commented that the statement by the comprehensive college presidents is one way to fix transfer but this suggestion is not being accepted. A counter proposal is that all freshman and sophomores must complete all 10 silos regardless.

f. D. Garner asked if there was a comprehensive set of actions for issues on transfer disagreements.

g. T. Good asked if the package will go to the Joint Committee before it goes to the BoT. R. Palm responded that the resolution has to come back to the Joint Committee to make recommendations with respect to make actions that the BoT can take.

h. T. Good asked to be assured that there will not be any surprises coming out of the Provost’s office. R. Palm responded that there are some things we can't control.

i. T. Good asked about the Provost’s vision of GEAR and ACGE. She also pointed out that as funding gets cut, practices such as assessment, keeps falling on back of the faculty. R. Palm replied that assessment will not go away.

j. T. Good pointed out that the GEAR members are volunteers and it is difficult to find time to meet as a committee, especially given that there is no money for travel. R. Palm stated that we should keep talking about assessment.

k. M. Schaefer asked about money spent on remediation of students. D. Garner felt that State Ed and the K-12 system has to pay more attention to getting graduates ready for college. M. Schaefer stated that open admissions often means underpreparedness.

l. B. Jubenville mentioned that the Council wanted to endorse the white paper written by the Nursing Task force but recognized that the Provost is still looking at it. R. Palm responded to please endorse it.

Friday, October 17, 2008

A. Call to Order

President Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

B. Welcoming Remarks

1. Professor Milton Johnson, President of FCCC, welcomed the new delegates and mentioned that almost 100% of the delegates from the 30 campuses were in attendance. He also stated that there is a call for papers for the CIT conference at Oswego from May 19th to 22nd.
2. Dr. Joseph Hankin, President of Westchester Community College, welcomed the Council to WCC. He shared the history of WCC and some demographics of student and staff population with the delegates. He expressed concern over possible budget cuts after the next meeting of the legislature on Nov. 18th.

3. Professor Iris Cook, Plenary Host and Coordinator welcome the delegates to her home campus.

C. Community College Office Update

Denise Bukovan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Office of Community Colleges discussed four issues, the budget, transfer and articulation, workforce development, and the capital reinvestment campaign with the delegates.

1. Budget: The community colleges dodged huge bullet with respect to the budget since the base aid was left untouched though there was a 6% cut in categorical programs. The Governor has called a special executive session of the legislature on Nov. 18th to discuss the financial crisis. There is no way to predict what the outcome of that meeting will be. NYCCAP met and their strategies will be to ask for restorations of whatever cuts come from the Governor and $100 increase in base aid. NYCCAP is presenting the case that historically, the community colleges are very important during bad economic times. D. Bukovan also stated that the Governor has moved up the budget process. 2009-10 budget requests are due a month earlier than usual and the Governor plans on presenting the budget in December.

2. Transfer and articulation: D. Bukovan applauded the work of the Joint Committee on Articulation and Transfer and encouraged the Council to support the resolution developed by the committee. She mentioned that the Board of Trustees (BoT) and the Provost are looking for comprehensive package to solve transfer issues.

The following discussion ensured.

a. When asked by M. Steuer, D. Bukovan replied that she did not know where the University Faculty Senate (UFS) stood on the resolution but that the BoT was very positive and supportive. M. Steuer asked her to comment on the Comprehensive College President’s statement on articulation and transfer. She commented that currently, the BoT does not want to make any changes to general education but the community colleges are encouraged to have AA and AS graduates complete all 30 credits of general education prior to graduation.

b. When asked by K. Reiser who is pushing the completion of all 30 general education credits prior to transfer, D. Bukovan replied the Provost and some members of the BoT.

c. C. Wood stated that there seems to be a disconnect between the resolution and the need to complete all 30 general education requirement. He noted that there needs to be more discussion at Provost’s level.

d. When asked by K. Reiser, D. Bukovan replied that it was her understanding that there will not be a resolution that links transfer and general education presented at the BoT meeting.

e. B. Jubenville stated that general education should be woven within all curriculums, part of a continuous education. Though the Provost feels that there is not enough time to complete major work as it stands now, he feels that is not true. We can still offer some major courses at the community college. D. Bukovan replied that C. Wood should be a champion for this. She wondered who said that general education has to be lower division; though this seems to be the belief by State operated campuses.

f. C. Wood noted that the requirement to complete all 30 general education credits prior to obtaining junior status is a requirement imposed only on transfer students. He felt that it was not sound policy to impose a different policy on community college students than on native students.
g. T. Good asked D. Bukovan to comment on the chart of proposed solutions for transfer put together by D. Golladay. When asked when the community college information will be loaded into the SUNYACTS website, D. Bukovan replied that there are plans to do so. T. Good mentioned that the site is hard to navigate because the community college information is not there.

h. After acknowledging that the aforementioned chart was a summary, T. Good noted that #1 on the chart was not consistent with the language in the Joint Committee’s resolution in that the chart addresses only liberal arts and science majors while the resolution addresses all AA and AS degrees. M. Johnson felt that the language of the chart seemed narrow. D. Bukovan replied that she felt that these were saying the same thing but asked for our comments so that she could advocate for our needs. T. Good stated that the language of the chart should be the exact language of the resolution. She also mentioned that there seems to be some inconsistencies since the BoT does not want to discuss general education but is pushing for the all 10 silos be completed prior to transfer.

i. D. Bukovan noted that the Provost and the Comprehensive College Presidents have been pushing for the completion of all 10 silos prior to transfer and that it has been discussed in the Provost’s report to the BoT. P. Pietropaolo noted that though this statement is true, the Community College Presidents are not in support of the completion of all 10 silos prior to transfer and she is not sure what is in package that is going forward. K. Rieser pointed out that there is a lot of confusion at this time and that we keep hearing that general education and transfer will be linked in the package. She wondered how we could find out what’s in the proposed package. D. Bukovan suggested she ask the Provost and the V. Chancellor directly but she felt that presently the intent was for community college students to complete 10 of the 10 general education silos prior to transfer but that it was not a requirement.

j. T. Good pointed out that some of the community college vice presidents feel that this is a requirement since we have to send all programs to SUNY for approval.

k. S. St. John Jarvis expressed concern about the language since she heard that the completion of the 10 silos prior to transfer would be a recommended requirement, which is a huge difference and that once a resolution is approved, it becomes a mandate.

l. M. Johnson noted that any change in the general education requirements may affect the timeliness of the degree completion by our students.

m. When asked by R. Peterson if the BoT is also considering a resolution for same requirement at state operated colleges, D. Bukovan replied that it was her understanding that any resolution will apply to all students across the System.

n. When D. Buchanan suggested that FCCC prepare letter to the Provost strongly recommending that diffusion of general education throughout the curriculum be the approach that SUNY adapt.

o. K. Reiser stated that we have already discussed this with the Provost. She suggested that maybe it makes sense for all of us to look at general education since it has been 10 years since the last review. She asked D. Bukovan to make the Vice Chancellor aware that any changes in general education must be vetted through faculty governance and the Presidents. D. Bukovin acknowledged the request.

p. A. Lundahl questioned how the information on the transfer website from the community colleges might differ from the information already provided by the state operated campuses. D. Bukovin stated that she had the same question. She believes that since the information comes from articulation agreements, thus the information should be the same but it is her understanding that there are some omissions.
q. When asked by A. Lundahl whether the resolution by the Joint Committee would render these articulation agreements mute, she responded yes in a perfect world but there may still be certain programs with unique requirements that may still require articulation agreements.

r. B. Jubenville noted that only 19 or 20 of the state operated campuses are presently on the transfer website. He wondered if there is a plan to have all 30 baccalaureate institutions on the site. D. Bukovin responded that she hoped so and that she didn’t know why anyone would be exempt

3. Workforce development: D. Bukovin reported on a consortium that included community colleges that was started 3 years ago in order to write grants. She mentioned that the Office of Community Colleges is looking for ways to develop intercampus relationships for the purpose of grant funding.

4. Capital reinvestment study – D. Bukovin reported that this is currently a state wide study of campus facilities. The results of the study will be used in future master plans and as basis for funding and capital funding. D. Garner asked about the time table and purpose of the study. D. Bukovin responded that the study will be conducted during the next six months and will provide a rational plan for funding capital projects.

5. Other Items of Discussion:
   
a. When asked by A. Lundahl about SUNY funding for the CCSSEE, D. Bukovin responded that SUNY will provide funding. P. Pietropaolo responded that a letter has gone out to the campuses that we are moving forward with CCSSEE and that campuses should register with CCSSEE and appoint campus point person. The deadline for this is 11/1.
   
b. M Delaney noted that the ACT critical thinking exam is supposed to be funded by SUNY. D. Bukovin and P. Pietropaolo could not respond but suggested M. Delaney contact N. Willie-Schiff.
   
c. D. Bukovin requested the M. Johnson meet with her to help coordinate efforts with respect to the resolution by the Joint Committee and the package that will brought by Provost to the BoT. M. Johnson agreed.

D. Liaison Group Remarks

1. NYCCAP
   
Cliff Wood, President of RCC, and a representative for NYCCAP applauded the work of FCCC and stated that he was an advocate of shared governance at all levels. He stated that we must continue to push on transfer issues. He is concerned that the BoT is only hearing the Provost’s position. We must try to make the BoT aware of our position. He reiterated that there should not be expectations made by the state operated colleges on transfer students that are not made on the native students. He supported the position that taking all general education courses in the lower level is not a sound practice. He suggested that we take one step at time, start with the AA and AS degrees. We should look at the course that the state operated colleges are requiring their freshman and sophomores to take and we should encourage our students to take at these courses and complete these competencies as well. He noted that some degrees we created as AAS degrees will need to be changed since they are no longer necessarily terminal degrees because students need additional education. He pointed out that if we are truly a System, we have to have the same expectations of all students regardless of where they start. He recommended that we look at competencies required prior to junior year, not necessarily the courses. He noted that the website is important though he pointed out that the information about the community colleges on the website is the information provided by the upper division schools. He encourages us to keep challenging the state operated
colleges because we are all part of the system but they have to value our credibility as educational institutions. He recommended that we look at the recommendations of the Commission on Higher Education and continue to push SUNY to be what it wants to be, a System. He believes in what community colleges are all about; access and affordability. He stated that his perception of what the Board wants to do with respect to general education is different than the perception of the Provost’s office. He suggested that we talk about general education from the perspective of money. Presently, the state operated colleges have not been given enough money to increase capacity so why would they want to keep their students around longer than they have to by requiring them to repeat courses and why should we, as taxpayers, have to pay for courses twice.

The following discussion ensued.

a. R. Peterson asked about the Pick a Prof site and FOIL request and wondered why there was not a System-wide response. C. Wood replied that NYCCAP decided unanimously not to respond. He further mentioned that Donna Bullock informed the Presidents that you must make public any information that you would generally make public. He feels that the purpose of evaluation is to make improvements. T. Barthel stated that since Pick a Prof is not a taxpayer in NYS, then why do they have the right to request information paid for by NYS taxpayers.

b. S. Richman asked C. Wood about NYCCAP support for a non-voting seat for the President of the FCCC on the SUNY BoT. C. Wood provided the President’s perspective on this issue. He stated that the faculty at state operated colleges are employees of state of NY but community college faculty are employees of the community college and if they cannot be members of the local Boards, they should not be members of the SUNY Board. In addition, he felt that having faculty sitting on the Board which deals with salaries, personal issues, etc, would be conflict of interest. S. Richman pointed out that we want to have voice on SUNY board because many of the resolutions passed by the Board effect the community colleges. C. Wood suggested that the FCCC needs to talk with Presidents about this issues, especially with respect to the impact on this on the local level. There has been a lot of change lately, so there’s reason for hope.

c. T. Barthel returned the discussion to general education by agreeing with C. Wood’s statements about the differing requirements for community college transfer students. He also pointed out that at many state operated colleges, lower level courses are taught by teaching assistants. He felt that community college instructors are just as qualified to teach courses in major as instructors in the state operated campuses. T. Barthel felt that this approach was a reduction of a liberal arts education and if students are not involved in their major early on there could be problems. C. Wood felt that there was a bigger question, namely why do students change major so often.

d. When asked by M. Steuer about how to approach the issue of general education, C. Wood replied that we need to make sure that our position doesn’t stop somewhere but makes it all the way to the BoT. He suggested that the FCCC should state the case directly, through the appropriate channels to the Provost’s office. In addition, we should be sure that the BoT is aware of our position as well. He felt that in this case, since there is a philosophical difference between us and Provost and we need to keep the message going.

e. M. Steuer stated that this is another example where students are treated better by the private colleges than SUNY. He pointed out that some of the private colleges require different general education classes than SUNY and wondered what we, as advisors, should do. C. Wood responded that it is important to talk about competencies not courses, within this system. He pointed out that not all the state operated campuses have the same general
education courses (standardized courses) but all have the same competencies. “It’s about competencies not courses.”

2. **Joann DeFeo**, from Nassau CC, representing CCBOA provided a review of the last CCBOA conference. She provided information on membership, activities, and Albany updates. M. Johnson suggested that FCCC and CCBOA discuss possible areas of partnership.

3. **Budget Outlook** – CCBOA, Mort Meyers, VP of Administration RCC
   a. M. Meyers discussed the present budget crisis. He presented a scenario for the average community college and how it will be affected by this budget crisis.
   b. B. Axelrod pointed out that workforce development and partnering with businesses can present another opportunity to increase revenue. He also pointed out that historically, when the economy is in crisis, the community colleges will generally benefit. M. Meyers stated that this is generally true but enrollments may need to go up a lot depending on size of budget cut.
   c. M. Schaefer asked if there was a way to know the impact of the shrinking credit and loans on enrollment. M. Meyers did not really know. He wondered if a significant increase in tuition would effect enrollment. He mentioned that each college is different and will have to do its homework.
   d. When S. St. John Jarvis asked if the push to go paperless is costing us students in a certain population, M. Meyers replied that he felt that the best way to recruit is to communicate with parent and student, via internet and text messaging, new students are using this. Paperless with respect to to internal things have nothing to do with recruiting. Contact directly with mailings
   e. D. Garner wondered whether the four day work week effects student enrollment or retention. M. Meyers stated that he believed so. M. Johnson responded that he did not believe that a four day work week was beneficial to the students since the more time they spend on campus, the more relationships they can build. D. Garner mentioned that students were under pressure to work more because of the tightening of the loan market.
   f. M. Steuer mentioned that increase in enrollment implies increase in expenses to which M. Meyers replied that increases in expenses are not dollar for dollar with enrollment; the more student you have may not do you much good if state reduces total instead of base aid.

---

**Saturday, October 18, 2008**

**Business Meeting – Morning**

**A. Call to order**

M. Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:40 am

**B. Approval of minutes**–

On a motion by T. Good and seconded by K. Reiser, the minutes from the spring 2008 plenary were approved as submitted.

**C. Old Business**

NYCCT: M. Johnson stated that the organization held a successful new trustees orientation, Trustees Institute 101. In addition, NYCCT is filing legal action on behalf of 3 trustees because their terms were shortened.
D. New Business

1. President’s report – M. Johnson
M. Johnson gave an update on the search for a new Chancellor. M. Schaefer asked M. Johnson to comment on problems with the process. M. Johnson replied that it was a frustrating process, dragged out and delayed too long, resulting in the loss of many of the candidates. Though a search firm had been hired, the current Board members had not yet been seated which resulted in some delays. The search committee is looking for someone who will give longevity to SUNY. At this moment, there is only one candidate remaining and it seems like search will be reopened. When asked by M Steuer whether the Governor will have the final say about the appointment, M. Johnson replied that the final say resides with the Board.

2. Committee reports

1. Academic Affairs
K. Reiser reported that the charges for the committee are in delegates’ packets. She continued to report that B. Jubenville and her meet with N. Willie-Schiff, Assistant Provost involved with assessment, to discuss her vision of GEAR, general education and concerns about the co-chairs of GEAR. When questioned about the present co-chairs of GEAR, N. Willie-Schiff replied that Patty Francis is now the System representative. When asked about her vision of GEAR and general education, she replied that she is willing to move forward with the assessment initiative. In addition, the committee will be looking to endorse the Nursing Task Force white paper and looking at K-12 partnerships.

K. Reiser asked for a sense of the body about the proposal to require community college students to complete 10 of the general education silos prior to transfer.

The following discussion ensued.
   a. J. Halsey replied that it seems like we’re getting mixed messages. The Provost says the completion of all 30 general education credits by community college students prior to transfer were always part of the policy yet it is not supported by BoT resolution or the Salins’ memo. She felt that the BoT needs to hear our voice, because currently they are only hearing the Provost’s voice and since her opinion carries a lot of weight, she will be able to sway them.
   b. K. Reiser pointed out that Trustee Cox is adamant that general education is not linked to transfer but P Pietropaolo mentioned that completion of 10 out of 10 silos will aid in transfer.
   c. B. Axelrod felt that completion of 10 out of 10 silos will restrict transfer.
   d. T. Barthel wondered who came up with previous number of 7 general education silos that need to be completed prior to transfer? Why 7 and not 5 or 8? He wondered how many general education credits must be completed by the native state-operated students prior to being awarded junior status. He felt that he did not have enough information to form an opinion.
   e. K. Reiser stated that the community college Presidents formulated an opinion, years ago, and made a commitment to complete 7 of the 10 silos at their level.
   f. M. Steuer believed that after a review of our programs it seemed reasonable to commit to 7 out of 10 silos.
   g. T. Barthel expressed concern for those faculty members who do not teach general education and may therefore lose their jobs if they are forced to teach more general education courses.
h. R. Peterson pointed out that the only thing we have to go on is Salins’ memo. He also stated that every degree program around System has been updated to include 7 out of 10 silos, so it would cause a major upheaval to now require all 10 silos. There should not be any changes without more information. There’s been an understanding in place for many years and everyone involved has to respect the process.

i. B. Axelrod agreed that a change would cause a major disruption across System because all our programs have 7 out of the 10 silos. He felt that NYCCAP should stand up and speak out. He also mentioned that we need to know what Student Assembly is doing. He felt that FCCC, NYCCAP and SA should come together as one group and present to the BoT.

j. M. Steuer felt that we should not take a stand at this moment.

k. T. Good expressed the opinion that she was not sure that the President’s memo (from Salins) is a guideline. She also stated that when you send programs to SUNY they will not be approved unless they contain completion of at least 7 or the 10 silos. She continued to state that we hear the Provost saying that she is not in support of general education as it presently exists and we have the memo from 1999. She believes that some review of general education should take place and that we need to have a process in place to complete this review. At this moment there is pressure to go with the 7 out of 10 silos and she supports this as a temporary recommendation until general education is reviewed again using sound assess practices.

l. M. Schaefer stated that there are programs that cannot accommodate any more requirements and this proposal seems to be a move to create general education educators and higher education educators.

m. R. Peterson believed that the UFS is probably not on board with us and wondered where the UFS fell during that negotiation process. He felt that a resolution of clarification would be good so that we don’t disrupt current programs which include 7 of the 10 silos.

n. T. Barthel pointed out that the general education silos originated in the mind of Trustee DeRussy and due to her pressure they came up with a magic number of 7.

o. T. Good pointed out that NYS education law contains no mention about general education; it says liberal arts and science courses must account for ¾ of AA and BA degree and ½ of AS and BS degree. She feels that we have reduced liberal arts and science to general education and it is not the same. We need to look at this, and we may need to have a temporary fix.

p. T. Barthel felt that more research was needed, such as the Board minutes from 1999 and newspaper articles.

q. M. Delaney wondered if there is a strategic reason why we should not take a stand now.

r. B. Axelrod stated that there is a report on general education from the Provost’s office that we could look through to see where these mandates came from.

s. M. Johnson pointed out that the two issues are whether we endorse the completion of 7 out of 10 silos or take a stand against the requirement to complete all 10 silos prior to transfer.

t. D. Garner asked when the Provost plans on making the recommendation to complete all 10 silos and felt that we should take a stand prior to then.

u. K. Reiser felt this would probably happen at the next Board meeting. She felt that there is probably a resolution out there presently. It would have to go through the Board’s Academic Affairs and Community College committees but things can happen so quickly.

2. Governance
   S. Richman presented the initiatives to the delegates. He mentioned that committee wants to reenergize its campaign to lobby for a seat on the Board for the FCCC president. In addition, the
committee will be looking at code changes. B. Axelrod pointed out that under Board policies; the UFS is the official body of faculty governance for all SUNY faculty, which is not true. S. Richman replied that we will plan a strategy on how to address this.

The committee will also look at supporting the Presidents’ request for budgetary increases as a way to enhance student success.

The committee will also be addressing strengthening shared governance by developing a statement on shared governance for the Council’s approval. The committee would like to distribute the statement to all campus governance leaders and find a way of bringing governance leaders together, possibly at our spring plenary.

3. Community College Relations
I. Cook discussed the Distinguished Service Award and that the committee will be looking for nominations. Nomination can be made by anyone from SUNY, must be forwarded by 1/21 and include a rationale, and description of the efforts and accomplishments of the nominee. She also asked delegates to promote the Distinguished Professor rank on their campuses. She mentioned that at the state operated campuses, the Distinguished Professor rank carries a $2500 increase in pay.

4. Student Life
A. Lundahl stated that the committee’s work on the student engagement survey has not gone well so far. The committee will table this initiative for the moment. The committee will be investigating the “Pick a Prof” site to see what impact can we make as a committee in educating the students about the considerations when picking professors. The committee would like to investigate the “sense of belonging” of our students after they transfer. The committee will be looking at what the state operated campuses do to ease assimilation and developing a list of best practices. B. Axelrod pointed that that the literature shows that major difference between community colleges and dormitory colleges is social integration, that social integration increases success, and suggested that maybe we would like to complete a study to see what the community colleges are doing about social integration and develop a best practices list.

A. Lundahl presented information about the new textbook laws, pointing out that the NYS law goes into effect in July 2009, while the Federal law goes into effect in 2010. There is a call for increased transparency in textbook costs and places the burden on the publisher. Bundling is no longer recommended, the previous edition and the last three copyright dates must be available. Faculty can help by providing textbook orders in a timely fashion.

The following discussion ensured.
   a. B. Axelrod pointed out that newer editions are coming out fast and furious and bookstores latch onto them and force students to buy newer editions.
   b. M. Schaefer wondered why we do not electronic textbooks given that we live in an electronic age. He believes that we should tell the publishers that this is a way we need to move.
   c. T. Barthel pointed out that textbooks are easy to produce and to not over produce. The problem is that you cannot find old editions.
   d. D. Garner wondered how many colleges have bookstores that operate under FSA. He believed that FSA runs bookstore with slightly elevated prices for texts but funds other college initiatives. It is been a convenient way that has been used for decades that allow the college to fund these activities. Most of the delegates stated that their bookstores are
run by a FSA. M. Johnson mentioned it was a collection of student monies that are used to supplement budget.

e. When asked by M. Steuer about the requirements of the laws, A. Lundahl replied that the federal law requires publication of the text, title, ISBN, previous 3 copyright dates, and that these should be published on the master schedule to the maximum degree possible.

f. R. Peterson equated this to the “Pick a Prof” site in that it is another source that students will use when picking a professor.

g. A. Lundahl stated that the purpose was to give students information about alternative cost saving sources.

h. T. Good pointed out that there is a difference between practice and policy and that we might want to consider the impact of these laws on academic freedom. She continued that we should be careful not to lose sight of what we might be losing

4. Information Officer’s Report

A. Catalano reported that the website is up and running and that there is additional information that she needs to get onto the site. She asked delegates to contact her with any mistakes and suggestions. A. Schmidt applauded A. Catalano’s work and wondered if it would be possible to have a photo gallery of past pictures. A. Catalano replied that it is planned for the future and that she needs pictures from each campus for website. She also envisions a chart with an archive of FCCC resolutions that contains the status and resulting action of resolution. She discussed the present listserves and asked for any updates. T. Good pointed out the importance of using the listserv in that it is the only way of sharing information about the campuses. She suggested that if governance items are happening on the campuses could be posted to the listserv so that the executive committee can keep on top of things. J. Halsey requested that if someone asks the delegates to respond to a question or survey that the person who is collecting the data post a summary. S. Richman asked the delegates to make their governance leaders aware that they have a listserv and can share issues with each other.

5. University Wide reports

1. Nursing Task Force White Paper

B. Selvick presented the paper to the delegates and pointed out that that report does not contain a statement about a mandatory BS for licensure though it is encouraged and that capacity is also addressed in the paper.

2. Joint Committee on Articulation and Transfer (JCAT)

T. Good presented the resolution from the JCAT along with some historical context. She noted that we passed a resolution at our last plenary, to which we received a “non response” from the Chancellor and that when the Council representatives to the JCAT took this resolution back to the Joint Committee, they were meet with anger from the UFS representatives. In July, the current resolution was drafted. She felt that if the JCAT did not pass something quickly, the Board would pass their own resolution. T. Good then presented a summary of the current resolution. The resolution calls for an enforcement of Board policy as it currently exists but she noted that the current Board policy only deals with students with AA and AS degrees while the resolution deals with all 100 and 200 level courses and requires that they should transfer to courses within the major. The resolution also addresses the development of a transfer website. T. Good pointed out that it is no longer about individual articulation agreements but a system wide agreement. A Transfer Review Committee (TRC) that reviews those courses where transfer is it not immediately apparent is created by the resolution. There is a concern about a possible misinterpretation of the duties of this committee by the Provost and Trustee Cox, both of whom thought that this committee would deal with individual student issues and appeals. They want a body that would make a decision and
respond within six days about individual student concerns. T. Good was concerned that we must monitor this situation carefully so that the TRC does not lose its power. She wondered whether there should be two committees and what their relationship should be. She pointed out that we should not determine transferability based on student learning outcomes but rather on course descriptions and possibly sample syllabi. She also felt that there will be a need for faculty within a discipline to get together, through SUNY sponsored events, to explore changes in their fields and wondered about funding. JCAT does not endorse statement from comprehensive colleges Presidents and pointed out that the statement did not go through any governance process. T. Good stated that she has heard that there is a resolution package coming on 11/18 but we really do not know what will be in that package.

The following discussion ensued.

a. M. Johnson wondered whether the Proposed Solutions for SUNY Transfer could represent the package.

b. When asked by M Steuer for a definition of outcomes, T. Good replied that outcomes specifically referred to the content of course, and her concern if content of two courses is not exactly the same then the course would not transfer and that the state operated campuses will dictate the course content.

c. When asked by M. Schaefer about the role of the Registrar’s office in the transfer process, T. Good replied that the website will make it easier for students to self-advise.

d. M. Schaefer asked for a definition of parallel programs and T. Good replied that parallel programs is Board language and admits it is somewhat fuzzy.

e. M. Schaefer pointed out that GPA are not part of parallel equivalencies, to which T. Good replied that GPA is an admissions issue. M. Johnson pointed out that there is Board policy that speaks to admissions.

f. M. Schaefer asked about the composition of the TRC to which T. Good replied that the committee will follow the model established for GEAR and ACGE and that the TRC will have access to discipline groups. K. Reiser pointed that the TRC will also have a student representative and a representative from the Provost’s office.

g. M. Schaefer asked whether we would need to review all courses. T. Good replied that all 100 and 200 level courses will transfer and that only the “quirky” courses will need to be reviewed. When asked about the need to review new courses, T. Good replied that would be left to the TRC but she envisioned a policy similar to the policy presently used for general education courses.

h. When asked by A. Schmidt whether present articulation agreements will be passé, T. Good replied that there will be reasons for articulation agreements, but in general they would not necessarily be needed

i. A. Catalano stated that she was concerned that non liberal arts course would not transfer? She stated that presently many of these courses do transfer

3. GEAR

T. Good presented an update on GEAR. She reported that System was in the middle of the triennial reviews and that there is some talk that campuses will not have to do reports any more. She also stated that System is presently facing a dilemma with its inability to find math test for SCBA. Campuses that want to use a nationally normed test can defer for another year or use the rubrics. She asked the delegates for advice as the direction and purpose of GEAR. She suggested that we could eliminate SCBA but with SCBA comes a funding piece and we would loose that funding piece. T. Good felt that both GEAR and ACGE are performances of shared governance and a place where faculty had a real voice within System but she sees both of them going away. M. Delaney
stated that in an ideal world, he would like to see a general education program and assessment plan that makes more sense and empowers faculty, and thought that GEAR might see if it could help make that happen. M. Johnson felt that general education should be re-examined and that process falls within the purview of GEAR. R. Peterson stated that he was having hard time finding down sides to letting SCBA go. M. Murphy was appointed a FCCC representative to GEAR. Another position will need to be filled. Interested parties should contact M. Johnson.

4. Reports from the liaisons to the UFS Awards, Governance, Student Life and Undergraduate Committees were suspended until the afternoon business meeting.

Saturday, October 18, 2008
Business Meeting – Afternoon

A. Call to Order
M. Johnson called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.

B. Old Business

1. UFS Governance Committee
T. Barthel reported that the UFS is looking at placing a governance handbook on website. A. Catalano would like to link to this website.

2. UFS Awards Committee
I. Cook reported that the UFS is looking into the creation of CSEA needs awards.

3. UFS Student Life Committee
C. Boyd reported that the UFS is exploring a service learning handbook, student health services, publishing “Traditions” to the website and creating a best practices statement with respect to student leaders.

4. UFS Undergraduate Committee
K. Reiser reported that no one attended the meeting.

A. Committee Reports and Resolutions

1. Academic Affairs
A motion was made by and seconded by the AA committee to approve the transfer resolution, AA1-2088-09, as presented by K. Rieser.

The following discussion ensued.
   a. B. Axelrod asked where this resolution would go if it passed. He made a motion, seconded by B. Selvick, to amend the original statement to add “Be it resolved that we encourage the Chancellor to support this resolution,” This amendment was accepted by K. Reiser.
   b. T. Good stated that she thought that was not the purpose of the resolution or the reason we send a resolution.
   c. M. Johnson stated that the purpose of sending the resolution is for information and when the Chancellor responds, he may or may not support the resolution.
   d. B. Axelrod stated that the responses were not always coming back supportive.
   e. K. Reiser suggested that an alternative would be to include the suggested language in the letter that accompanies the resolution.
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f. M. Steuer supported the amendment made by B. Axelrod but suggested another modification which was acceptable to B. Axelrod. He suggested that the language be changed to “... we encourage the Chancellor to support the resolution of the JCAT.”

g. S. Richman spoke against the amendment. He stated that all of our resolutions are meant to inform, guide, and provide input to SUNY. The suggested amendment belongs in a cover letter since this is our resolution in support of JCAT and we would like Chancellor to do same.

h. R. Peterson also spoke against the amendment stating that this statement is better served in letter.

i. B. Axelrod pointed out that a resolution requires a response on the record while a letter does not.

j. A motion made by R. Peterson and seconded by S. Richman to call the question passed.

k. The amendment did not pass.

l. M. Delaney made a motion, seconded by S. St. James, of a friendly amendment: “Be it further resolved that the FCCC respectfully requests that the Chancellor forward this resolution to the SUNY Board of Trustees.

m. T. Barthel called for a point of order and stated that based on our experience lately, the Chancellor just ignores our resolution so why not send the resolution directly to Board. M. Johnson stated that it was not protocol. K. Reiser pointed out that M. Johnson can follow up with the Chancellor and M. Johnson pointed out that he can bring the resolution to the Board committees directly since he can speak at those events.

n. The amendment passes.

o. S. Richman makes a motion, seconded by R. Peterson, to call the question on the resolution.

p. The motion resolution passed with 1 abstention.

q. T. Good reported that at 1:50 the UFS passed the resolution from the Joint Committee.

r. A. Catalano asked whether the delegates should ask for a vote of support on their individual campuses. M. Johnson stated that the delegates should share the information with their campuses. A. Catalano pointed out that some campuses have already passed a resolution in support of the resolution from the Joint Committee. K. Reiser replied that when M. Johnson asked the delegates to gather information and feedback about the resolution, some campuses decided to pass a resolution.

s. When asked by A Schmidt whether we should have our campuses approve the resolution from the JCAT, M. Johnson replied that it was not necessary.

A motion to approve AA-2-2008-09, an endorsement of the Nursing Task Force white paper, was made by K. Reiser and seconded by A. Turton. B. Selvick stated that the paper was going to the Provost’s office since it was commissioned by the Provost. I. Cook thought it would be nice if we could deal with the working environment of nurses. A. Lundahl asked whether the paper mandates a B.S. for an entry level nurse. B. Selvick replied that the paper does not call for this. L. Susice suggested some changes to the wording to improve the clarity of the statement. The resolution passed unanimously. J. Halsey asked whether we should present the resolution to our campuses as an FYI or ask them to endorse it. T. Good stated that we should save campus endorsements for very hot issues. Our resolutions have the strength to stand on their own and we should save campus strength for when we need to rally troops. K. Reiser felt that we should save campus endorsement for important points. M. Murphy stated that she found it useful to have information about the white paper prior to meeting so that she could come armed with feedback from her campus. A. Lundahl agreed with this statement. A. Catalano asked if the Council wanted to post the white paper on the website. K. Reiser responded to wait until the Provost publically endorses it.
The consensus of the Academic Affairs committee is that the Executive Committee should be prepared for quick response if there is a move to push the completion of all 10 general education silos. The committee asked the delegates to forward any talking points to the Executive Committee.

2. Governance
S. Richman and J. Halsey presented a newly developed statement on shared governance to the delegates for Council approval.

The following discussion ensued.

a. When asked by K. Reiser about the first paragraph, S. Richman replied that it was a distillation of several other sources.

b. R. Peterson made a friendly amendment to the wording which was accepted.

c. T. Barthel stated that it was difficult to find an educational organization that does not have a statement on shared governance.

d. M. Steuer questioned the appropriateness of the wording about hiring.

e. M. Delaney pointed out that the statement says that hiring is one area where faculty have a “primary role in the formation of policy related to”

f. When M. Steuer still questioned the wording of the statement, S. Richman pointed out that the AAUP statement contains the same list as the FCCC statement. In that case, M. Steuer suggested getting an union opinion on the statement.

g. T. Barthel was concerned about the use of the word “primary”; stating that it was a matter of language and wondered how strongly we wanted to state our role. He pointed out that statements by AAUP may contradict our statement, to which S. Richman responded that what AAUP states does not matter since this is our definition.

h. M. Johnson pointed out that participation of faculty in student policies, i.e. student code of conduct was missing from the statement, S. Richman replied out that it mentions Academic Student Affairs. M. Johnson thought that it might be too broad.

i. There was a discussion about the strength of the language in the statement. Lauren suggested changing the word “primary” to integral. B. Axelrod supported softening the language. Several delegates felt that the language should be softened. S. Richman felt that the statement should have a strong voice and that softening the language would go against most of the sources.

j. When questioned by M. Steuer about whether faculty should have a primary role in registration, S. Richman responded that faculty should have a primary role in determining policy.

k. M. Murphy replied that she felt the statement contained a harshness and suggested some language change. She stated that if we want to embrace shared governance, we have to be inclusive. B. Axelrod believes that this is something we all need to consider; if we are talking about shared governance, we should soften the statement a little.

l. S. Richman stated that key to the nature of shared governance is well defined roles for each constituency within the structure.

m. There was concerned among the delegates that documents cited to create the statement were often union documents

n. D. Garner felt that this instrument will be very useful as we conduct Middle States reaccreditation since it provides a good laundry list of what is expected from faculty.

o. R. Peterson wondered whether the statement could be changed after it is endorsed. S. Richman responded that in his view, it was a dynamic document that could be amended as
needed. R Peterson wondered if we must arrive at consensus today, to which S. Richman replied that we would like to arrive at consensus today in order to put it on the website.

p. After a motion to endorse the statement was made by A. Lundahl, seconded by M. Murphy and L. Susice, discussion continued.

q. M. Steuer asked if it is the intent of the committee to look into the faculty having a primary role with respect to hiring and suggested they discuss this with the union. T. Good spoke to M. Steuer’s concerns stating that state law says that faculty shall participate in the formation of the policy relating to hiring and should also present recommendations to the administration. She pointed out that the law says faculty not faculty governance. This is where the union and governance are two separate bodies and there is often an issue. She also suggested that the committee move the two bullet points under discussion into next paragraph as to appease our colleagues

r. M. Johnson asked whether the committee was suggesting that students play role in the promotion of faculty. S. Richman replied no. M. Johnson pointed out that the preface of the document defines all those bodies. He felt the statement that promotion is a part of shared governance was confusing.

s. B. Axelrod stated that promotion goes through two layers of faculty governance before goes to administration.

t. T. Barthel suggested sending it back to the committee to which M. Delaney stated that we would like to make use of this document as soon as possible.

u. On a motion by T. Barthel, seconded by Lee, the question was called. The call the question passed.

v. The amended statement on endorsing the statement on shared governance passed with 2 delegates opposed.

When A. Catalano asked whether this statement should go to all governance leaders, S. Richman replied yes with editorial changes.

S. Richman stated that the Governance Committee is currently discussing ways to bring campus governance leaders together to discuss governance. One suggestion was to invite them to attend the spring plenary. There may be money to support their travel expenses. He will ask the Executive Committee to develop an agenda that includes a panel discussion on governance and an opportunity to caucus. He also suggested that the governance leaders be allowed to attend our business meetings as observers.

3. Community College Relations
   A. Catalano presented information about the website. She is looking for ways to attract people to the website and has created links to current issues. A nomination form for distinguished service award will be on the website.

4. Student Life Committee
   C. Boyd reported that the committee will collect information on student success and assimilation at the next annual transfer and articulation conference. The information will be used to identify best practices and create a panel to present at the 2010 conference. In addition, the committee will investigate the “Pick a Prof” website. It was felt that we need to gather more information in order to develop an argument against this site with the students. M. Johnson thought is might be helpful to read the actual FOIL request while investigating the legality of complying with the request

5. Budget Report
A proposed budget for 2008-2009 was presented by T. Good. On a motion made by I. Cook and seconded by M. Delaney, the budget proposal passed.

6. Other Items
   a. The Executive Committee needs to look at all proposals for future meetings and consider the locations in order to provide balance across the state.
   b. S. Richman requested that the Executive Committee consider budgeting more time for committee meetings at the next plenary.

7. Good of the Order Resolutions
   a. The Cookian October Chronicles was presented by T. Barthel
   b. I. Cook presented a Good of the Order resolution.

8. Adjournment by 2:30

Respectfully submitted;

Maryann Faller
Secretary
Appendix
Nursing Education Resolution
Resolution AA2 -2008-09
Passed unanimously October 18, 2008

WHEREAS the Faculty Council of Community Colleges welcomes and applauds the efforts of the Nursing Education Task Force, established by the Office of the SUNY Provost with appointments from the Faculty Council of Community Colleges and the University Faculty Senate, and

WHEREAS the SUNY Nursing Education Task Force, primarily consisting of nurse educators from all levels of SUNY, has issued a White Paper: Addressing the Growing Shortage of Registered Nurse Clinicians and Educators in New York State, August, 2008, and

WHEREAS this paper addresses three challenges: preparing entry-level RNs to increase the workforce; increasing the capacity of nursing programs by preparing and retaining faculty and by addressing infrastructure constraints; and retaining RNs in the NYS workforce, and

WHEREAS the paper presents a set of recommendations to meet these challenges,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Council of Community Colleges endorses the Task Force’s report, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the FCCC requests the SUNY Provost to exercise the powers of that office to implement the recommendations presented.

Resolution on System-wide Transferability
Resolution AA1-2008-09
Passed Unanimously October 18, 2008

WHEREAS the Faculty Council of Community Colleges expresses continued concern for the transferability of our courses when students transfer to other SUNY colleges, and

WHEREAS we welcome and applaud the efforts of the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation, established by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges and the University Faculty Senate,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Council of Community Colleges hereby strongly endorses all provisions of the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation Resolution of 7-30-08, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Council of Community Colleges charges its Executive Committee to monitor the implementation of the resolution of the Joint Committee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the FCCC respectfully requests that the Chancellor forward this resolution to the SUNY Board of Trustees.
The Role of Faculty in Shared Governance
Statement approved by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges
October 18, 2008

“Shared governance” in higher education refers to structures and processes through which faculty, professional staff, administration, governing boards and, sometimes, students and staff participate in the development of policies and in decision-making that affect the institution.

There is no single model of shared governance. However, there is general agreement about the elements of effective shared governance. Such governance requires

• well-defined areas of authority that are the primary responsibilities of each of the governance components (i.e., faculty, administration, governing board, students, etc.);
• recognition that various areas are interrelated and that all components have a stake in the overall governance of the institution; and
• collegial and cooperative relationships among all components.

While the governing board of an institution of higher education has ultimate authority, the other components of the institutional governance structures should take the lead in areas of their expertise and their authority should be respected.

Most conceptions of shared governance recognize that faculty are best qualified and should therefore have a primary role, through a sound and well-established governance structure, in the formulation of policy relating to:

• Curriculum
• Methods of instruction
• Academic standards
• Academic student affairs
• Program development
• Degree requirements

Furthermore, faculty should have significant input, through their governance structure, into all other areas that affect the academic functions of the institution. This input should extend to areas that include, but are not limited to:

• Budget development
• Mission, planning (strategic and operational)
• Institutional Assessment
• Searches for key leaders
• Development of personnel policies and procedures
• Hiring and evaluation of faculty
• Awarding of promotions, sabbaticals and research support

While the administration and governing board of the institution are compelled to consider faculty resolutions and recommendations, they are not required to accept or implement them. However, rejection of resolutions or recommendations should occur rarely and then for specific compelling reasons which are communicated to the faculty governance structure that made them.
Shared Governance Resources

Selected resources (available online) that address the nature of shared governance:

- Governance bylaws of NYS Community Colleges at Faculty Council web site
  [http://www.fccc.suny.edu/ccgovernance.html](http://www.fccc.suny.edu/ccgovernance.html)

- American Association of University Professors, “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities”
  [http://www aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/governancestatement.htm](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/governancestatement.htm)

- American Federation of Teachers, “Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities”

- American Federation of Teachers, brief policy statement on “Shared Governance”.
  [http://www.aft.org/topics/shared-governance/index.htm](http://www.aft.org/topics/shared-governance/index.htm)

- National Education Association, policy statement on “Faculty Governance in Higher Education”
  [http://www2.nea.org/he/policy6.html](http://www2.nea.org/he/policy6.html)

- National Education Association, policy “Statement on Community College Governance”
  [http://www2.nea.org/he/policy-cc.html](http://www2.nea.org/he/policy-cc.html)

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education, “Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation”
  See Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

- Education Commission of the States “Policy Paper on Shared Governance in Community Colleges”

Resources in print:

Edited volumes that consider current issues in shared governance
