Minutes from the Spring 2009 Plenary Meeting of FCCC - Draft

The Faculty Council of Committee Colleges (FCCC) met at the Otesaga Hotel from March 26th – 28th. The meeting was hosted by Mohawk Valley Community College.

Thursday, March 26, 2009

President Milton Johnson welcomed the delegates. He gave a short presentation about the Retirees Service Corp. At 3:30, the delegates attended committee meetings.

Friday, October 17, 2008

A. Call to Order
President Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:45 am.

B. Welcoming Remarks
1. M. Johnson welcomed the delegates and governance leaders. Representatives from all 30 campuses and 17 governance leaders were in attendance. He envisioned great opportunities with a new Chancellor and her ability to move System forward. He stated that progress has already been made, especially in area of transfer.
2. Randall J VanWagoner, President of Mohawk Valley Community College gave welcoming remarks. He discussed shared governance on MVCC’s campus.
3. Bob Jubenville, plenary host delegate, from MVCC delivered some welcoming remarks.

C. Affinity Group Report
Cliff Wood, President of Rockland Community College addressed the delegates.

C. Wood believes that shared governance is very important and the RCCC has made progress in this area. He stated that the value of shared governance is in talking things out and coming to consensus.
1. Workforce Development and Stimulus Money- He felt that we need to take this opportunity to talk with the incoming Chancellor given the influx of stimulus money. He believed that community colleges know about workforce development and it is time for the community college faculty to lend their expertise in developing these types of programs. He believes that students who become involved in workforce development come back later to take credit programs. He stated that although we must provide skill training, we must also create a literate workforce.
2. Transfer-C. Wood addressed transfer issues and noted that our students are often able to transfer more credits to out-of-state and private colleges than SUNY schools because these schools accept the AA or AS in totality. He believes that we have to continue to push the SUNY transfer schools to accept the AS and AA degrees and all general education competencies taken in the first two years. He feels that System has yet to get to the heart of the transfer issue.
3. Office of the Community College- He noted that there were not enough resources in the Office of Community Colleges and that this speaks to System’s commitment to the community colleges.

D. Office of Academic Affairs Update
Harold Silverman, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs addressed the delegates.

H. Silverman discussed his vision of shared governance. He believes that through shared governance, we need to advocate for what is important to us. He brought greetings from the Provost’s office. The Provost sent her gratitude for all service provided by the faculty. He discussed the following issues.
1. Transition to a new Chancellor – The new Chancellor begins 6/1. She has sent in several transition teams to review the organization of the office and how it functions. In addition, the teams will look at student mobility, an overview of the Provost’s office, the K-12 relationship, and enrollment planning. She plans on visiting all the campuses during the summer.

2. Audit in the assessment area – Nancy Willie-Schiff is in charge of this area. Auditors looked at the Assessment of the Major (AoM). No community college reports were audited. The auditors asked questions about whether an AoM had been conducted when scheduled, how much material was missing from the report, and whether an external reviewer response was included. Though the audit was not complete at this time, some of the findings included that 95% of all the majors that were scheduled to be assessed were assessed and that System’s record keeping was not complete due to personnel issues and the volume of material received. The auditors recommended that SUNY streamline the assessment process. In addition, they recommended that System should come up with a master list of programs to be assessed from the programs registered with the State Education Department, ask campuses to only send a sample of the reports, and choose assessment activities that improve and maintain the integrity of the program.

3. CCSSEE survey – Nancy Willie-Schiff is in charge of this area. CCSSEE is part of each campus’s SCBA plan. He stated that CCSSEE posts summaries of the results on line and that it is not true for NSSE and is contrary to SUNY’s non-disclosure policies. He pointed out that some of the community colleges have been using the CCSSEE for a long time and would like to continue using it.

4. Student Mobility – The Commission on Higher Education discussed the issue of transfer and articulation and brought it to the attention of the BoT. He believes that if the present problems with transfer and articulation are not worked out, the BoT or the legislature will make a policy change. He believes that the new Chancellor may want to link the issue of student mobility with the K-12 initiative. He stated that the transfer website has been created and is being updated. It was meant to be a catalog, and he admitted that there are still some problems.

5. Reengineering SUNY – H. Silverman discussed the proposed changes in the current structure. The reasons for reorganization is to save money, centrally locate services, and restructure programs. In addition, the Reengineering SUNY will be looking at the way SLN operates.

The following discussion and question and answer session followed. Highlights of the session are listed below.

1. Reengineering SUNY - the BoT had set up the committee to look at this issue and is currently gathering information. H. Silverman suggested that the faculty should give input whenever there is an opportunity. It was suggested the Admiral Crane should be contacted with input.

2. CCSSEE –
   - GEAR required CCSSEE to be approved by campus governance as part of the campus assessment plan but not all campuses followed this procedure.
   - Campuses were asked to send questions to be included in CCSSEE and it was noted that not all the questions dealt with student engagement. H. Silverman responded that some campuses submitted questions and some did not. System used those suggestions to create the additional questions on the survey.
   - Concerns were voiced about the confidentiality of the results. When questioned about the publication of the results, H. Silverman responded that some campuses have been using the results for a long time and he believed there was some value in a longitudinal study.
   - Concerns were voiced about the administering protocol
   - Concerns were voiced about the effect that the publication of the results will have on faculty and what they do everyday or how their students learn.
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- When questioned about SUNY’s choice of CCSSE for a student engagement survey, H. Silverman responded that SUNY felt that CCSSEE was one of the better instruments, that it provided longitudinal data, and if we can use the data to tell us something important about transfer or other student issues, it is valuable. He felt that this issue needs to be resolved by SUNY working with faculty leadership.
- It was recommended that H. Silverman look at the Task Force recommendation #12 to get a better understanding of the faculty perspective.
- It was noted that CCSSE is a different type of assessment that provides information about our students that our other types of assessments do not. It was stated that results should be reported in the aggregate, not campus by campus.

E. Community College Office Update

Denise Bukovan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Office of Community Colleges addressed the delegates.

D. Bukovan brought greetings from the Vice Chancellor. She updated the delegates on the following issues and initiatives.

1. The office is preparing for the transition of a new Chancellor by writing briefing papers on each of the community colleges.
2. She updated the delegates on the ongoing Presidential searches.
3. The office is involved in the transfer initiative. When asked by T. Good whether the transition team will be speaking to the JCTA, D. Bukovan replied that she had to check with the Vice Chancellor.
4. D. Bukovan stated that the office has been testifying about what the state should do to ensure that the community colleges can provide affordable education to the Higher Education Committee in legislature. She believes that the legislature is leaning towards eliminating cuts made by Governor.
5. She discussed the federal stimulus funding and stated that the office has collected information from all campuses on capital requests to give to the Governor to forward to the President. She noted that stimulus funding was eliminated from bill for higher education. SUNY is now trying to figure out what money will be coming to the community colleges. She suggested that the community colleges work closely with their communities on workforce development.
6. She stated that SUNY will fund half the capital reinvestment study and that it will be used for master planning and capital requests.
7. She mentioned the 60th anniversary history event at the beginning of April.

F. Making Shared Governance Work for Your Institution

S. Richman introduced the session which included presentations by Denise Bukovan and Kimberly Reiser. He welcomed all the campus governance leaders. Each presenter shared a PowerPoint and handouts with the participants.

A question and answer and discussion session followed. Highlights of the session are listed below.

1. The relationship between the shared governance body and the local BoT was discussed.
   a. It was stated that the President communicates on behalf the governance body to the BoT.
   b. It was pointed out that on some campuses new degrees, but not courses, are presented to the BoT and very little else will go to the BoT. D. Bukovan pointed out that new programs must go to the BoT for approval.
c. There was a question about whether any campus sends items directly from their governance body to the BoT. Most campuses send the recommendations from the governance body to the college administration which will either accept or reject them.

2. There was discussion about the relationship between the shared governance structure and the faculty union.
   a. There was a question about whether the governance body should collaborate with the union on contractual language.
   b. There were concerns that on some campuses the governance body is seen as being an adversary of the union and in some cases the work of the governance body is undermined or blocked by the union.
   c. On some campuses, the union is the governance body and that arrangement was questioned.
   d. D. Bukovcan pointed out that it is important to distinguish between the governing body and union, that each body should carefully delineate its roles and responsibilities. She believes that unions deal with terms and conditions of employment though she noted that issues may arise from one body and go over to the other.
   e. K. Reiser pointed out that scholars do not recommend that the one body serve both purposes. It takes away from the authority of each and the BoT will see the two bodies as linked and not respect either.

3. Many campuses discussed their individual shared governance structures.

4. There was a discussion as to whether upper level administrators should be part of the governance structure.

5. It was mentioned that in 2001, the FCCC produced a paper on shared governance.

6. It was pointed out that the California system of shared governance is outstanding and that there was legislative action to support shared governance.

7. It was noted that in some cases, once faculty were given the responsibility of shared governance they did not want it or wanted it and would not give up any power.

8. D. Bukovcan noted that faculty should be informed and there should be a structure through which faculty can provide input but sometimes faculty are handed responsibility that they are not ready to handle.

9. There was a discussion about the resolution of a governance recommendation. It was noted that sometimes a governance body approves a recommendation to which there is no response.
   a. K. Reiser suggested putting a time limit on Presidential decisions.
   b. It was also suggested that if a recommendation is rejected by a VP or President, that a rationale must be presented.
   c. Another idea is to use a transmittal form on which recommendations and rationales can be listed together with the final disposition of the item and then returned to the governance body.

10. It was pointed out that the campus climate is so important and that many of the local BoT's are uninformed. It was requested that the FCCC and NY CCT talk about workshops on shared governance to which K. Reiser responded that this has already been done.

11. There was a question about whether the bylaws of the shared governance body need to be approved by the local BoT.

G. Budget Update

James Van Voorst – Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration addressed the delegates.

J. Van Voorst said there were severe cuts earlier this year. He stated that in November, there was a 10% cut in the proposed budget by the Governor, but since then he has backed off on the cuts for this year.
The 2009-2010 budget is still being discussed. He pointed out that the K-12 sector will receive a good deal of stimulus money that the Governor can use as he sees fit. In addition, he stated that the 09-10 rental aid cut will be annualized for this year and that there is no talk about categorical aid cuts. He stated that in the budget requests, we asked for additional $100 per FTE but received a reduction of $270. He pointed out that there was an increase of a little over 5,500 unanticipated students in the community colleges. He also stated that the Vice Chancellor will work with Presidents on tuition increases. When asked if there were any discussions about capping applications, J. Van Voorst replied that he as not aware of any such discussions at the System level but he had heard that some individual campuses have discussed this because of the rental aid cuts.

II. Business Meeting

I. Call to Order

M. Johnson called the meeting to order at 2:09

II. Approval of Minutes

On a motion by A. Lundahl, seconded by S. Richman, the minutes from the October Plenary were accepted.

III. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the body

IV. New Business

A. President’s Report

The President’s report was in each delegate’s packet. M. Johnson had nothing to add and there were no questions.

B. Committee Reports – Each committee presented an update on its actions and initiatives.

   a. The committee will be discussing CCSSSE, streamlining assessment, and the transfer website.
   b. Implementation of the JCTA resolution will be left to the ExComm as stated in our resolution.
   c. Data about NACEP accreditation has been compiled and the results will be discussed.
2. Governance – Co-chairs S. Richman and J. Halsey
   a. The committee has accomplished all its present initiatives.
   b. The committee had decided that lobbying for a seat on the BoT for the President of FCCC will be put on the back burner.
   c. S. Richman asked all governance leaders to use the governance listserv to its best advantage.
3. Community College Relations – Co-Chair L. Cook
   a. This year’s Distinguished Service Award recipient is Dr. Shirley Pippins. T. Good will be accepting award on her behalf.
b. Guidelines for the Chancellor Awards can be found in the delegate’s folder. There will be some modifications for the community college nominees. For more information, the FCCC website has link under awards.

4. Student Life- Co-Chair A. Lundahl
   a. Social integration for transfer students is still an issue. There are very few programs in state-operated schools to help or provide support for transfer students. It appears that transfer students seem to be more dedicated to their studies, rigorous in their approach to education and more curriculum focused than other students. The committee will be going to statewide transfer meeting to see what programs are available to help with the social integration of transfer students.
   b. A summary of the Pick a Prof site, provided by C. Boyd, is in the delegates’ packets. This site doesn’t seem to have as much impact as previously believed. This committee was going to engage in talking with students, but that does not seem to be necessary now.

5. Information Officer’s Report – A. Catalano reminded the delegates about the website and the information contained on the website. In addition, she reminded delegates of the listserv guidelines, specifically that union or contract issues should not be discussed. She also shared that FCCC has purchased a subscription to Survey Monkey. If a delegate would like to gather information, please send the questions to A. Catalano. She will create a survey and after a prescribed time period, compile the data and send it to the delegate for analysis and dissemination. When asked whether it would now be appropriate to use Survey Monkey to ask union issues given that it is not the listserv, M. Johnson replied that we should continue to keep union and governance separate. He recommended that if you are unsure about the appropriateness of a question to send the question to A. Catalano and a decision will be made.

C. University Wide Reports and Discussion
   1. GEAR – T. Good
      a. T. Good has provided the delegates with extensive written report. Presently, GEAR is in middle of reviewing triennial reviews. There is discussion about the standardized math test. It currently only maps to three of the five outcomes. GEAR is currently working on formalizing a policy about participating in a pilot using the standardized test. GEAR is also reviewing CLA for use in assessing critical thinking and written communication.
      b. There was a discussion about the closing the loop activity and report.
         i. T. Good explained that the closing the loop report shows how you are using assessment to improve student learning. She pointed out that GEAR does not approve the closing the loop reports but does give feedback to the campuses and that Middle States is now stepping up in their examination of your closing loop activities. GEAR can provide some ways of thinking about closing the loop that could be used for Middle States.
         ii. It was noted by B. Axelrod that if you complete an assessment and you find that many students are not meeting the standards, the department will design activities to improve the program and to help students to learn. He stated that GEAR is asking the campuses to use the data to improve programs and be feels that the closing the loop report helps them to focus more intentionally on their programs.
         iii. There was question about the value of assessment in improving teaching and learning and the additional burdens it places on faculty.
         iv. It was pointed out that assessment and closing the loop is not always about fixing something that is broke but also supporting something this is working. It can be about maintaining things that work and bringing people together.
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c. There was a discussion about the standardized math tests. It was pointed out that the test can only assess the first three competencies and the campus can split its assessment into two parts, the standardized test and the rubric.
d. There was discussion about faculty ownership of the current learning outcomes. It was noted that if the loop that is being closed is measuring learning outcomes for which there is no faculty ownership then System cannot expect faculty to participate.
e. It was suggested that campuses create an a campus wide assessment day when no classes will be held to allow for faculty participation in looking over the data and creating closing the loop activities.

2. JCTA and TRC – T. Good and J. Halsey
A PowerPoint presentation and handouts were shared with the delegates:

a. There was a brief review of the history of the JCTA and the JCTA resolution.
   i. It was noted that the BoT would not endorse the JCTA resolution until the committee developed an implementation plan and part of the plan was the creation of TRC.
   ii. The BoT wanted JCTA to create an appeals process which was not part of resolution. This has been developed.
   iii. The Provost asked JCTA to put together the faculty disciplinary conferences which was the last part of the resolution.
   iv. The resolution called for a Transfer website. T. Good presented the website to the delegates. The link to the website is on the Provost’s page.
   v. It was pointed out that according to the resolution, the understanding is that all courses will transfer and appeals should occur only as an exception.

b. Problems with the implementation of the resolution were discussed. It was pointed out that since the resolution has not been implemented, currently transfer is on a course-by-course, campus-to-campus basis instead of systemwide.
   i. A review of the website confirms that courses do not transfer seamlessly and that there are many inaccuracies since the community college data has not been uploaded.
   ii. Academic Affairs is concerned about this issue and believes the website is doing more harm than good.
   iii. It was pointed out that sometimes the website says a course will not transfer yet in actuality, the course does transfer.

c. There was a discussion of the TRC
   i. The TRC was originally created to consider courses transferring from 2-year colleges to 4-year colleges but the vision of the new Chancellor is student mobility in all directions.

d. Problems with the website were discussed.
   i. The website committee has not met and the website is incomplete which creates problems.
   ii. Students are not told that the website is incomplete.
   iii. It was noted that since the website is not a BoT mandate, if a campus refuses to comply, there is no consequence.
   iv. It was pointed out that a lot of students take the initiative to use the site and we don’t always know that student’s courses have not been accepted.
   v. It was stated that the website is more for show than functionality.
   vi. It was pointed out that some of the students think the website is a wonderful tool.

e. The student appeals process was discussed.
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i. It was pointed out that there is a student appeals process that must first go through the campus-based process and the decision can then appealed to Provost's office.
ii. It was pointed out that for some students, this may be a problem. They may not yet be registered students at the 4-year college but they have already left the community college.
iii. T. Good stated that the student appeals process is really a BoT initiative and that the TRC is involved in the campus-appeal process not student appeals.
iv. It was pointed out that the TRC was designed by the resolution to deal with systemwide issues, the student appeals process was designed to deal with that lone student.
f. There was discussion about actions that should be taken by the FCCC in response to the issues listed about.
   i. T. Good asked the delegates for recommendations as to what we should do about the lack of adoption of the resolution by the BoT. She asked them to consider the following questions. What do you think needs to happen with respect to the website? What kind of input should we be asking for? Should we be waiting until September? How should the faculty development workshops happen?
   ii. It was wondered if there was something we can do to enforce the idea of how important adopting this resolution is.
   iii. There was a question about an impending statement by the BoT on transfer.

Saturday, March 28, 2009

A. Call to order
M. Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:06 am

B. Liaison Remarks

I. Carl Wiezalis – President UFS
C. Wiezalis presented the updates and initiatives of the UFS. In addition he stated that shared governance is a power game in which participants want to make sure our power is equal to the power on the other side.
   A. The Student life committee is developing a service learning tool kit. The committee is also interested in veterans' affairs and is preparing survey about how vets are serviced, what they need and what are their perceptions within SUNY. He noted that the new Chancellor has a special interest in this area. The committee is also interested in student leadership development.
   B. The Governance committee is focusing on faculty leadership development.
   C. The Undergraduate committee is developing a an internship guide.
   D. The Sustainability committee is trying to put together an advisory council to the Chancellor's task force on sustainability, which will include ten subgroups to address different areas within sustainability.
   E. The Ad Hoc Ethics committee had sent out an ethics survey to all faculty within the System, but the results were so poor that the committee will reissue the survey. The committee will be investigating ethics for all levels and will measure needs of the community in order to put together educational programs.
   F. The Diversity committee is designed to support Office of Diversity within SUNY.
C. Wlezalis also addressed the issue of articulation and transfer. He felt that there seems to be a need on the part of the trustees to re-write the JCTA resolution; they may want authorship/ownership of the document. He stated that he just wants this to get done well for our students.

Highlights of the discussion that followed are below.
1. When questioned about the Commission on Higher Education report, it was stated that the new Chancellor is aware of it and it will influence her chancellorship. It was stated that she will be developing a strategic plan that outlines how to get from where we are now and to where the CHE says we need to go.
2. It was noted that the CHE report addresses transfer and states that it should be accomplished by 2011.
3. It was stated that the BoT wants to re-write the JCTA resolution and that instead they should be proud of the fact that the faculty wrote it. M. Johnson pointed out that the BoT has publicly acknowledged the work done by the committee and thanked them. They have stated that they are proud of what the faculty have developed and remarked that this may be the first time such an initiative was accomplished without legislative intervention.
4. It was noted that implementation responsibilities on transfer lie with the Provost's office.

II. Melody Mercedes, President Student Assembly

M. Mercedes presented an update and the initiatives of the Student Assembly (SA). In addition, she discussed the structure of the Student Assembly. She noted that the Student Assembly meets twice a year while their Executive Committee meets monthly.

A. SUNY DAY
B. The SA rallied outside capitol and legislative buildings as well as on individual campuses. They presented a petition with 11,000 signatures telling the legislature to stop stealing from SUNY students.
C. The SA has been working on an editorial blast that deals with the allocation of tuition revenue and cuts in resources. They have a meeting with the legislators every week to discuss financial cuts and other issues in the Governor's budget proposal.
D. She stated that SUNY students are truly unified. They have taken ownership of their education, with a common mantra, "This is our SUNY and we’re through with anyone trying to mess with it." She stated that the BoT recognizes that students are the first line of defense against budget cuts.
E. She expressed a desire to have continuing conversations with the FCCC and felt that there are many things on which we could work together.

C. Business Meeting

I. Call to Order
M. Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:53 pm.

II. Old Business
There was no old business to come before the body

III. New Business
A. Liaison reports
Minutes from the Spring 2009 Plenary Meeting of FCCC - Draft

1. UFS Governance Committee – T. Barthel
   a. Governance – J Halsey reported that she and S. Richman would like to thank all the campus governance leadership (cgl) for their participation in the workshop. It was noted that the cgl voted on a resolution that recommends that the FCCC invite them back. The cgl would love to have an opportunity to meet alone while we’re meeting during our committee meetings.

2. Community College Relations – I. Cook reported that she had nothing new to add to her earlier report.

3. Student Life Committee – A. Lundahl reported that the committee is looking into the social integration issue for transfer students.

4. Academic Affairs

   The committee made two recommendations.
   1. The committee recommended that M. Johnson send a letter to the Provost asking for a response to the FCCC resolution on the nursing white paper.
   2. The committee recommended that the delegates and the cgl get involved in the campus planning committees for the Chancellor’s campus visit.

The committee presented three resolutions.

   Resolution 1 – CCSSEE

   A motion to approve a resolution on CCSSE was made by D. Garner and seconded by S. McDermott. Below are the highlights of the discussion that ensued.

   1. Several delegates (7) expressed concern about CCSSE’s the lack of confidentiality.
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2. When questioned about the nature of the data published by CCSSE, it was stated that if you go to the CCSSE site, you can find out every college’s actual results together with bar charts, summaries, and individual responses to all the questions.

3. When questioned about a statement that the college must agree to allow the data to be published, it was stated that if you agree to use CCSSE, you must agree to allow CCSSE to publish the data. This is different than the requirements for the state-operated campuses.

4. It was pointed out that on the CCSSE website, there is a disclaimer that the company does not support the use of data for ranking and comparison of technical and community colleges.

5. When the question was raised about the disadvantage of revealing this information, it was stated that SUNY has always stated that campus to campus comparison is undesirable and the lack of confidentiality changes this policy. In addition it was noted that whenever data is released publicly, we have to worry about the misuse of the data. It could be used to close schools, programs, etc., or to make comparisons out of context that could impact our students.

6. It was noted that the comparisons made out of context are apples to oranges.

7. It was the opinion of one delegate that confidentiality in colleges really doesn’t exist, if someone is collecting data then there is no confidentiality.

8. It was further noted that for campuses to have their SCBA assessment plans approved by GEAR, campuses had to agree to assess the campus environment and the only approved instrument was CCSSE. It was the understanding of the GEAR group that the campuses had to give their permission to post the results, but it turned out that that was not true. If a campus did not give CCSSE permission to publish their results, they could not use CCSSE, and thus they would not have their assessment plans approved and therefore would not be in compliance with the BoT mandate.

9. The validity of the instrument was questioned. It was pointed out that the research does not support the validity of instrument, that many of the questions are not about student responsibility.

10. Two delegates pointed out that there are other ways to measure student engagement, such as adapting the SOS.

11. One delegate felt that CCSSE may not be a bad instrument since it is important to measure students’ perceptions about whether the campus is supporting them in their development.

12. It was pointed out that not all campuses were administering the instrument in the same way.

13. One delegate pointed out that it is not about the quality of the instrument but about the fact that the data is collected in different ways which introduces problems, the confidentiality breach and that comparisons could impact funding.

14. S. Richman made a motion, seconded by I. Cook to call the question. This motion passed.

15. The motion to approve resolution 1 passed unanimously.

Resolution 2 – Streamlining Assessment

Introduction: Academic Affairs thought timing was right to reexamine GEAR and SCBA and to make the point to System that there is a duplication of effort with the various assessment requirements to which we must respond. The committee thought it would be a good time to ask System to streamline assessment and allow us to only participate in those assessment activities necessary for the Middle States accreditation.

A motion to approve a resolution on streamlining assessment was made by B. Jubenville and seconded by I. Cook. Below are the highlights of the discussion that ensued.
1. When asked about the reference to assistance in the resolution, it was stated that it was expected that System should supply staff support to help us in meeting the necessary requirements of Middle States accreditation. It was suggested that the resolution clarify this. It was pointed out that this was not the right place to deal with specifics since the resolution deals with policy. The specification of the kinds of support deals with implementation. It was felt that we could articulate this later.

2. It was noted that this resolution does more than call for streamlining assessment; it states that SUNY should not be mandating any assessment.

3. There was some question as to whether Middle States assessments were more or less rigorous than SUNY assessment.

4. M. Steuer made a motion, seconded by R. Peterson, for a friendly amendment to the resolution. He suggested that the words “less rigorous” be replaced with “and more narrowly focused, reflecting lower academic standards”.
   i. Several delegates (3) did not support the amendment.
   ii. It was pointed out that we were losing sight of the point of the resolution, namely to eliminate SUNY assessment.
   iii. A motion, made by S. Richman and seconded M. Delaney, to call the question was made and passed.
   iv. The motion on the amendment failed.

5. D. Garner made a motion, seconded by T. Barthel, for a friendly amendment to the resolution. He suggested that the words “less rigorous” be removed.
   i. It was pointed out that redundancy was the key issue.
   ii. It was pointed out that redundant also means not necessary
   iii. A motion was made by K. Reiser and seconded by S. McDermott, to call the question, and it passed.
   iv. The motion on the amendment passed.

6. S. Richman made a motion, seconded by M. Delaney, to amend the statement. He suggested that “therefore” be added before redundant. The amendment passed.

7. A motion, made by M. Delaney, to call question on resolution 2 passed.

8. Resolution 2 passed unanimously.

Resolution 3 – Transfer Resolution

A motion to approve a resolution on transfer was made by D. Garner and seconded by R. Peterson. Below are the highlights of the discussion that ensued.

1. It was felt that this resolution strengthens the previous transfer resolution by requesting the BoT stand by its own resolution.

2. A. Catalano suggested a friendly amendment to add “seamless” before systemwide transfer. It was accepted.

3. M. Steuer felt that faculty and administrators should still have access to the website but student access should be eliminated. He made a motion that was not seconded, to add the statement “still be available to faculty and administrator access.”

4. Several delegates (5) stated that they would not want the website available to students until it is complete.

5. There was discussion about having the website in a beta testing format. It was thought that it would be important to be able to access it from an administrative perspective to check on changes and progress.
6. The delegates were reminded that it is important to review how we got a website, that it was a mandate from the Provost’s office and it received no faculty review until it went live.
7. Several delegates (4) supported the idea to take the website offline and develop it in consultation with the JCTA before going live again.
8. It was pointed out that it would be difficult to maintain accuracy with a fluid and dynamic website.
9. The delegates were reminded that J. O’Connor stated that System would have difficulty maintaining the website because they don’t have resources.
10. J. Halsey made a motion, seconded by S. Richman, to amend the resolution by adding “in full consultation with the JCTA” after offline.
   a. Several delegates stood against the amendment since there was no guarantee that there will always be resources available to maintain the website and that this amendment would add a lot of additional work and responsibility to the work of the JCTA.
   b. It was suggested that the amendment should say in consultation with the faculty.
   c. It was pointed out the website committee is in the JCTA resolution.
   d. A motion made by M. Delaney, seconded by A. Lundahl to call the question was made and passed.
11. A motion made by S. Richman and seconded by A. Lundahl to call the question on the resolution was made and passed.
12. The resolution passed with one nay.

Additional discussion:

1. When questioned by K. Reiser as to whether the delegates should bring the above resolutions back to our campuses, debate them and support them, M. Johnson replied that the delegates should take them back to their campuses and that the FCCC would benefit hearing how each campus responds.
2. K. Reiser made a motion, seconded by D. Garner, that each of the campuses should endorse the assessment resolution and present the other resolutions as points of information. A motion to call question passed and this motion passed unanimously.
3. A motion was made by R. Axelrod, seconded by M. Schaefer, that since the other two resolutions are equally strong and that the campuses vote to support those resolutions as well. A motion to call the question passed but this motion failed to pass.

IV. Statistical Summary per Campus –
Statistics, prepared by George Anker, were distributed and explained by M. Johnson.

V. Budget Report

T. Good presented the budget report and asked for questions. Given no questions, a motion to accept the budget was made by L. Susice and seconded by B. Selvick. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Elections
Elections were lead by S. Richman. There was one nomination for each position. The secretary was asked to cast one vote each for J. Halsey for VP/ Treasurer and M. Faller for secretary.

VII. Future Meetings
M. Johnson pointed to information about the fall 2009 plenary in the delegates' folders. He requested that any delegate interested in hosting the spring 2010 plenary should get in touch with him.

VIII. Good of the Order
I. Cook introduced an informal and formal resolution for the good of the order.

IX. Adjournment 12:30

Respectfully submitted;

Maryann Faller
Secretary
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Appendix
WHEREAS the SUNY Board of Trustees Resolution on the Implementation of Strengthened Campus Based Assessment (June 2004) states, 
   "This academic assessment shall be accompanied by a measure of the level of student engagement in academic activities, as a way of providing a context for interpreting assessment data"; and

WHEREAS the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Assessment Reporting [May 2006] contains among its recommendations, item #12, that
   "System Administration should coordinate the administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) using procedures similar to those utilized in administering the Student Opinion Survey (SOS), with a focus on campus confidentiality and internal campus use of the survey results to make local improvements;" and

WHEREAS the above named report specifically states how confidentiality is to be preserved as outlined in the attached Appendix B to the report; and

WHEREAS it has come to the attention of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges that the policies of CCSSE do not lead to “campus confidentiality and internal campus use of the survey results”; and

WHEREAS following the mandate of SUNY System Administration, all of the SUNY community college campuses are administering the CCSSE in the Spring 2009 semester, using methods of data gathering that vary from campus to campus, possibly skewing the results; and

WHEREAS it is too late to stop the process for this semester; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the FCCC encourages the SUNY community college faculty and administrative leadership to administer the CCSSE survey as requested by System Administration for Spring 2009; and be it further

RESOLVED that the FCCC requests that the SUNY community colleges no longer participate in the CCSSE program in the future; and be it further

RESOLVED that the FCCC expresses its disappointment in SUNY System Administration for promising confidentiality in the survey when no such possibility ever existed; and be it further

RESOLVED that any instrument adopted by a SUNY community college campus for measuring the level of student engagement in academic activities shall be required to meet the confidentiality requirements cited above.

Passed Unanimously March 28, 2009
1. System Administration should only report data gathered through University-wide assessment for accountability purposes after adequate reliability and validity estimates of the measures being used are demonstrated.

2. Stringent guidelines should be developed and adhered to in order to ensure that confidentiality of assessment data is maintained.

3. Assessment results should never be used to punish, publicly compare, or embarrass students, faculty, courses, programs, departments, or institutions either individually or collectively, or to make public comparisons among groups of students based on gender, race, ethnicity, or other demographic factors.

4. System Administration should publicly disseminate assessment data only through aggregate reporting, for SUNY as a whole, or by sector.

5. While individual programs are free to use their own assessment results in ways they see fit, individual campuses should publicly disseminate assessment data only through aggregate reporting for the institution as a whole, or by school or college.
Resolution on Assessment

Resolution AA5 - 2008-09

WHEREAS all SUNY community colleges are subject to rigorous accreditation standards for The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) and for professional organizations; and

WHEREAS MSCHE expects institutions to assess student learning, it does not prescribe a specific approach or methodology. Instead, it requires institutions to be responsible for determining their expected learning outcomes and strategies for achieving them at each level (institutional, program, and course), assessment approaches and methodologies, sequence and time frame (See Characteristics of Excellence, Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning); and

WHEREAS compliance with MSCHE accreditation standards ensures that our students are "acquiring a knowledge base of sufficient depth and breadth and are fully prepared to meet the standards for advanced study, the qualifications of professional careers, and the needs of contemporary society;" and

WHEREAS the SUNY assessment mandate is therefore redundant; and

WHEREAS the value of SUNY-mandated assessment processes is not in proportion to the time and resources devoted to them and are, therefore, not cost effective; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED that SUNY campuses should receive assistance from SUNY System Administration in complying with the requirements from MSCHE and the various accreditation agencies; and be it further

RESOLVED that SUNY-mandated assessment is not necessary and that System Administration redirect time and resources toward providing that assistance.

Passed March 28, 2009
Resolution on Transfer

Resolution AA4-2008-09

WHEREAS the Faculty Council of Community Colleges (FCCC) agrees with the New York Commission on Higher Education’s (CHE) Final Report when it states
   1. the State of New York’s prominence as a great global center depends on the vitality of our institutions of higher education,
   2. our institutions of higher education must be positioned to adapt quickly to change,
   3. and that credit transfer is fundamental to educational access and upward mobility; and

WHEREAS the FCCC further agrees with the CHE’s recommendation that transfer and articulation are of paramount importance and recommends that articulation and transfer policies be strengthened and enforced to eliminate all unnecessary impediments; and

WHEREAS the SUNY Board of Trustees first recognized the need for seamless transfer in 1972 and subsequently passed policy and procedures stating that “graduates, when accepted in parallel programs at baccalaureate campuses of the University, would be afforded full junior standing and would be given the opportunity to complete the requirements for a bachelor’s degree within four additional semesters of full-time work;” and

WHEREAS the FCCC agrees with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) when it states:
   1. every institution’s admissions practices should ensure that students have a reasonable opportunity for success in meeting their educational goals, including transfer . . . ,
   2. and that academic freedom is central to the academic enterprise; and

WHEREAS, in October 2007, the FCCC recognized the urgency of the longstanding transfer problems and passed a resolution (AA1-2007-2008) asking that a representative Task Force be created to improve transfer; and

WHEREAS, in December 2007, the SUNY Provost and the University Faculty Senate established a Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation with the following charge,
   “The Special Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation is charged to explore ways of facilitating the transfer of students from one institution to another within the SUNY system and the articulation of programs that will facilitate the transfer process. In doing so, the committee needs to take into account the importance of smooth transfers of students within SUNY, the administrative feasibility of such a process, and prerogative of faculty to define the content of their courses and the resulting academic curriculum.” , and

WHEREAS the FCCC appointed representatives to sit on the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation; and

WHEREAS the SUNY Board of Trustees asked the Joint Committee to provide recommendations for strengthening transfer and articulation throughout the System; and
WHEREAS the Board of Trustees asked the Provost to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation and CHE Chairman Hunter Rawlings stated in his letter to Governor Paterson that efforts to strengthen articulation and transfer within SUNY are faculty-led; and

WHEREAS the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation Resolution was approved by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, the Student Assembly and the University Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation Committee developed Recommendations for Implementation of the Joint Committee’s resolution; and

WHEREAS seamless system-wide transfer is still not in place; and

WHEREAS the Joint Committee asked the Provost’s office to continue its work on the transfer website in full consultation with the Joint Committee so that the website provides transfer information that accurately adheres to the resolution; and

WHEREAS the SUNY ACTS website is incomplete, inaccurate, does not contain data submitted by community colleges; and

WHEREAS the website, as is, may harm students’ abilities to make informed decisions and may impede time to graduation; and

WHEREAS the FCCC is concerned about the lack of response from SUNY System Administration to these resolutions and the lack of progress made toward seamless transfer; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the FCCC urges the SUNY Board of Trustees to endorse and act upon the Joint Committee’s Resolution as approved by the FCCC, SA, and UFS; and be it further

RESOLVED that the SUNY ACTS website be removed from public access and be developed offline in full consultation with the Joint Committee on Articulation and Transfer to ensure accuracy.

Passed March 28, 2009
Shirley Pippins Resolution

Whereas she has been a continual and strong advocate for community colleges and their thousands of students, and

Whereas her history of academic achievement and increasing responsibility has placed her in a most promising and effective leadership role, and

Whereas she has succeeded in moving all of her colleges through great change to maximum opportunity and accomplishment, and

Whereas she has focused on the worth, mission and responsibility for education found in community colleges, and

Whereas her record of professional activities places her in the forefront of academic educators, and

Whereas she has specifically dedicated much of her professional life to community colleges in general, and SUNY’s community colleges as specific recipients of her good works, and

Whereas her vision and commitment to excellence has advanced the lives of all students with whom she has had contact, and

Whereas she is the embodiment of a higher education champion and innovator, and

Whereas her joy, humor and energy have been used effectively to benefit others,

Therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges bestows its 2008-2009 Distinguished Service Award on Dr. Shirley Robinson Pippins, in recognition of her sterling record of accomplishments in higher education and wishes her continued successes.
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Otesaga/Jubenville Plenary Resolution

Whereas the Man, the Myth, the Mystery have been joined by the:

Magic, Magnificence and Majesty of the Otesaga

In Historical Cooperstown,

And the humble work accomplished by our days

In the humanity of good company of our nights,

And

Whereas having stated the above, be it known by all here

present that the EXTREME GRATITUDE of the Faculty Council of

Community Colleges is offered to:

President Randall Van Wagoner, Mohawk Valley Community College

and Delegate Bob Jubenville, our host extraordinaire for,

generosity ending, renewal of motivation, the uplifting of spirit, and

the nourishment of body and soul in the delightful communion with

cherished colleagues!

So stated, this 28th Day of March, 2009

In Cooperstown, New York
Milton Johnson Resolution

Whereas he has been a "leader extraordinaire" for the past two years,

And

Whereas he has brought new respect and confidence to the Faculty Council of Community Colleges,

And

Whereas his gentle, yet forceful, demeanor has enriched each of his endeavors for our benefit and welfare,

And

Whereas he followed his sense of purpose with unflagging commitment and energy,

And

Whereas he has, effectively and consistently, been a powerful representative of all community college faculty within SUNY and beyond,

And

Whereas his comprehensive study of the issues in higher education has kept the FCCC at the cutting edge of today's challenges,

And

Whereas he presents a balanced and thoughtful assessment of problems and concerns associated with all issues,

And

Whereas he will be missed beyond description,

Therefore be it resolved, that each and every member of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, expresses admiration, appreciation and gratitude to President Milton Johnson, for his elegant and noble service to this organization, 2007-2009. Wishes for continued success and happiness far into the future accompany this resolution.

March 27, 2009
Spring Plenary
Cooperstown, New York