Thursday, March 25, 2010
I. Welcoming Remarks

President Tina Good called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm. She thanked M. Delaney, Heather Cruz and A. Catalano for all the arrangements and welcomed the campus governance leaders (cgl). She shared the agenda for this business meeting. T. Good reminded the delegates that when the SUNY Board of Trustees wanted to mandate system wide standardized assessment of general education, the FCCC came out opposed to this action which resulted in a compromise known as strengthened campus-based assessment (SCBA). However, the FCCC has always maintained that assessment should be campus-based. The most recent SUNY BoT resolution abolishes SCBA which is in keeping with the FCCC resolutions which were passed at the last two plenaries. We are very pleased with this new direction of the SUNY Board and with the open communication between the Provost’s Office and the FCCC in this matter.

Most campuses passed resolutions endorsing FCCC Executive Committee resolution on budget cuts; these were combined with NYCCT, NYCCAP and student resolutions. Now, the senate legislation called for restoration of $285 per FTE to budget. These are examples of the power of the Council, NYCCT and NYCCAP when we work together.

II. Possible Resolutions for consideration at Saturday’s business meeting

A. Academic Affairs Committee -Art Lundahl

A. Lundahl shared some proposed resolutions on SUNY General Education Requirements and the recently passed Assessment resolution. He stated that both proposed resolutions acknowledge our involvement in these initiatives. He asked for input and guidance from the delegates.

Discussion on general education resolution

1. Q – Are you sensing that people believe it is time for change? Is there an emerging consensus to continue the review? A – Yes at both the BoT level and the Council level, a need for change is being expressed. However, System Administration and the UFS have expressed concern over opening “a can of worms.”

2. When asked about the intent of the resolution, A. Lundahl replied that the committee sensed that it was time for us to review general education but did not want to make a recommendation about what should or should not be included in the general education requirement.

3. T. Good stated that the FCCC has a long standing position of opposing externally mandated learning outcomes and if we initiate a review of general education and the mandated student learning outcomes, we might be able to reopen the
conversation of externally mandated student learning outcomes. She also noted that the 4-year institutions have been saying that what we currently have for general education is not adequate since many are adding on additional local general education requirements.

B. Governance – M. Delaney and S. Richman
M. Delaney and S. Richman shared some proposed ideas for resolutions. Those ideas include the establishment of a work group to examine and strengthen shared governance within System. They also want to examine the processes for establishing the work groups on student mobility and the prescriptive nature of templates. They asked for input and guidance from the delegates.

Discussion
1. Student mobility and the process
   a. T. Good shared some information about the student mobility initiative. One of her concerns is that the discipline work groups get to dictate the content of the course to the rest of the faculty in the state because they are the only ones invited to participate in the process. She stated that currently there is no faculty governance involved and as we move forward we must change this. She reiterated that curriculum and standards is within the purview of faculty governance, so as this goes forward we must be part of the process of approving these templates and course descriptions.
   b. Concern was expressed about the time frame for this work is too short. It was noted that when you summon people to Albany with two weeks notice or make demands the 14th week of the semester; you really don’t want input you just want to say we asked.
   c. S. Richman read the resolution from the Ammerman campus. He pointed out that this resolution is about academic freedom. It expresses a fear that as these working groups go forward, they will start to be prescriptive about texts, etc.
   d. One delegate pointed out that even his campus president did not know about the working groups.
   e. A delegate pointed out that this implementation does not follow the implementation guidelines of the original resolution of the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation. The premise of the original resolution is that all courses transfer unless there is a problem. We had already been assured of the transferability of our courses.
   f. It was pointed out that when we got a new Chancellor and Provost we got another model.
   g. T. Good shared that future templates will not be going out to individual campuses for feedback because of the magnitude of the number of courses that will need to be looked at and approved. She feels that if a course or curriculum is not locally developed, then it is externally imposed.
Since not all campuses were included in the working groups, a delegate wondered what a campus would do if it has some objections to what is developed.

S. Richman reminded the delegates that the committee is speaking to the fact that the process is not appropriate and seeking a more appropriate process.

2. S. Richman stated that the committee is also investigating the current structure of the FCCC. It may be that the current structure does not address our needs and adequately distribute our workload. This will be a continuing discussion. In the history of the Council, the bulk of the resolutions come from the Governance and Academic Affairs committees, so maybe they should have more members. In addition, the committee is looking for ways to involve more of the interested cgl's.

3. S. Richman reminded the delegates of the elections during the business meeting on Saturday. He stated that nominations will remain open until just prior to the election.

III. Dinner Speaker

Dr. David Lavallee, SUNY Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, addressed the delegates.

1. Student Mobility

   a. The current work on student mobility is historic since it was an agreement forged by faculty from both the community and state-operated colleges and not mandated by legislature.

   b. The question that needs to be addressed is what does it take to become a full junior; i.e., what courses are needed in the first two years so that a student will be prepared to take junior level courses.

   c. The Provost’s office is identifying those “types” of courses that are required or are typical in most of the major programs.

   d. These courses will be guaranteed to transfer and must be accepted by all institutions while other courses can still transfer via articulation agreements.

   e. What are the steps?

      i. Identify those core courses that students would typically take in the first two years of a major program.

         1. These were identified by looking at articulation agreements within regions and noticing that patterns appeared.

         2. Presently 50 majors have currently been identified.

         3. There are currently a few programs in which it is difficult to identify those core courses.

      ii. If there appears to be discrepancies within those course descriptions then discipline groups will meet to identify course descriptors in broad terms.

         1. Faculty members that will form the discipline working groups will be chosen from the institutions that receive and send the highest number of transfers in that discipline.
2. Campuses will decide whether their courses fit those course descriptors. If they do, they will put the course on the website.

3. If necessary, there is an appeal process available by using the TRC. The TRC will attempt to resolve the issue by either working with the campuses involved or by sending the course to the discipline group.

4. When the course requires more than a broad description, the working group will be asked to provide those details via a template.

f. Questions and Discussion

i. Q – The original resolution from the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation had an underlying assumption that all courses will transfer. If a course does not transfer, it will be referred to the TRC who will then refer the course to a discipline group. The current implementation process seems to go against the resolution. A – Not all courses are guaranteed to transfer. Only those courses that are typically offered in the first two years of a major are guaranteed. This was further expanded on by K. O’Brien – The problem is that the language of “all” courses vs. “those courses typically taken in the first two years” of a major. D. Lavallee – Wherever possible, the emphasis is on course types. There are only so many credits that can transfer. Most majors require 18 courses in the major be taken in the upper division.

ii. Q - T. Good reiterated the previous question and noted that now there was a fear that these courses need to be identified and must match the course descriptors and that the 4-year colleges will be dictating our curriculum. There is concern about who will be choosing the working groups, how the courses will be identified, and how will the course descriptors be identified. A – This is a joint process. He reiterated that it started with identifying what “types” of courses students will “typically” take in the first two years of a major program. Then if there are vast discrepancies in course name or descriptions, the discipline group in that major will identify course descriptors. These core courses are the courses that lay the foundation and provide the students with the background for them to continue their junior year studies. This is not course to course transfer. It’s not about trying to match courses but to decide what students need to continue their studies.

iii. Q – What you told us in October is not the plan that is currently being implemented. The current plan is being implemented with very little lead time. How are the working groups being formed? A – The responsibility and authority for what courses get on the website lies with the campus. The groups are being chosen in every major from campuses with largest number of transfer students sent and received. Each campus has a contact person, generally the
articulation officer. The SUNY BoT ran out of patience with the implementation of seamless transfer and he had to move the process through quickly. We are giving people 3 weeks to look at the courses and answer the questions on survey monkey. The working groups will have 1 month to develop the course descriptors. When the work of all the groups is done, there will be a matrix on the website that campuses can put courses into.

iv. Q – What does this mean to my campus? If we choose not to follow the template, will our course no longer transfer? A – This now defines exactly what is needed to be a true junior. Now that it is defined, it is enforceable.

v. Q – Most of our students are Liberal Arts Math/Science or Humanities/Social Science majors. There are no such parallel programs at the 4 year institutions. A – For most of those majors, the number of credits in the major is so few that students will have adequate time in their last two years to complete them.

vi. Q – If a student takes a general education course and gets credit at the native school will it transfer as general education and be accepted as a course in the major? A – It can qualify as both if the student has a grade of C or better. If the student has a grade less than C then it will count as having satisfied the general education requirement but the credits will not transfer. You can meet the general education requirement with a grade less than C but the course and it’s corresponding credits will only apply to the major if the grade is better than C.

vii. Q – The resolution in November stated it was sufficient to have a grade of D. A – System will guarantee the transfer of course with a grade of C or better but a receiving institution may elect to accept credits from a course with a grade less than C. The Provost stated that the statement about a C or better grade will be put on the general education transfer addendum. In addition, if an institution requires a grade higher than C, it must be noted on the transfer website.

viii. D. Golladay noted that this policy creates parity among the 2 and 4 year colleges and it is centered on faculty decisions in the disciplines.

2. Strategic Enrollment Planning
   a. One main focus in this area is capacity.
   b. The following questions need to be addressed
      i. How do we provide access for those who might not otherwise have the opportunity?
      ii. How do we make the state more vital?
      iii. What do the students want?
      iv. How can we provide access for broad, liberal arts students?
c. The Provost noted that the real enrollment growth and innovation is in the community colleges. He wondered how SUNY can make sure that we have the capacity to serve this growth.

d. He noted that SUNY has no global planning.

e. He also noted that we need to encourage the programs we really need and to accent those programs.

f. He noted that all the above takes resources.

g. He stated that SUNY needs to come up with 3 or 4 really big ideas by deciding what we really want to do.

3. Assessment and General Education

a. The Provost’s office is working with faculty governance on the implementation of the resolution.

b. He believes it is time to review general education. He would like to form a group of faculty, CAOs, and System representatives to complete this review.

---

**Friday, March 26**

T. Good called the meeting to order at 8:40

I. Welcoming Remarks

1. Tina Good, President, Faculty Council of Community Colleges
2. Michael Delaney, Plenary Host, Erie Community College
3. Jack Quinn, President, Erie Community College

II. Chancellor’s address

Dr. Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor, State University of New York, addressed the delegates. She acknowledged the great past and present leadership of the FCCC. She stated that the role of her cabinet is to discuss issues and enhance communication. She shared a PowerPoint presentation on the Strategic Plan 2010 with the delegates.

Additional notes on the presentation:

1. After completing the strategic plan, she will be working on the SUNY brand expression.
2. She believes that the strategic plan should have one big idea namely NY’s economic revitalization and increasing the quality of life
3. She felt that it is hard for universities to think beyond education in the classroom and say to the State that we are your economic revitalization resource.
4. She wants the legislators to “Unshackle SUNY” with respect to PHEEIA.
5. She is currently looking at processes and relationships between System Administration and the community colleges and the organization chart.
6. Discussion, questions, advice, comments

   a. **Q** – Please give us a taste of the themes. **A**- The Chancellor decided to discuss the area of health affairs. She stated that each area will break into 3
strategic ideas that are attached to actions and metrics. Community Colleges will be asked to align their strategic plans with SUNY’s plan. The community college will be asked to identify the part(s) of the plan that they want to support and they will be held accountable for those.

b. **Q** – What is your vision for better integrating community colleges into SUNY?  
**A** – Communication is huge issue. The Chancellor feels that it is necessary to improve ways for community colleges’ to input into the SUNY plans. In addition, she wants to make sure that the leadership of community colleges is at the head table. She is looking for ways to better integrates 4 year and 2 year matters and suggested that maybe the academic affairs and community college committees of BoT should combine. She added that the Provost and chief officers at SUNY must represent both areas equally.

c. **Q** - Please comment on the Faculty Development Task Force. **A** - She and C. Hayden will co-chair a working group on faculty professional development and developing leadership.

d. **Q** – Please comment on our mission statement and how SUNY will assist campuses involved in the Carnegie engagement process. **A** - The Chancellor feels that the Carnegie model is a good model for engagement. She noted that there are several external measures of assessment that excellent, so we don’t have to reinvent the wheel.

e. **Q** – You stated that there will be matching actions and metrics in the strategic plan and campuses will define their own priorities within the plan. How do you plan on holding the community colleges accountable since there’s so much local control?  
**A** – She plans on working harder at communication with counties and System. She believes that we will never be strong if we work against each other and that System needs to reach out and become better acquainted with the counties and make the counties aware of the ways System can help them.

f. **Q** – As the number full time faculty decrease, there are less people to take on an increasing work load. What are your thoughts about the decrease in the number of full time faculty?  
**A** – We have not had a good relationship with the legislature and we cannot keep going to them with same old same old. The Chancellor said that we need to show legislature and the public that we stand for something. The strategic plan is our story. It shows how many jobs we can add to the state and other ways we can help revitalize the economy. What we can do will lead to the need for more full time faculty. We need to show the legislature that it is good for the state to investing in SUNY.

g. **Q** – The current fiscal situation is a deep problem and it’s not going to be pretty for some time into the future. Looking down the road, how is the fiscal situation going to jive with the grand ideas of strategic plan?  
**A** – The Chancellor believes that the budget will be a problem throughout her entire administration. She stated that the point of the Empowerment Act was to give us the ability to generate our own revenue when the State cannot support us; to allow us to be a more effective importer of federal funds, to forge better partnerships with private industry instead of increasing tuition.
h. Q – Three of the 32 students involved in the poster session are community college students. A- She believes that the poster session is a great idea. Whenever she travels, she talks about the research and honor programs in our community colleges.

III. Liaison Reports

A. Dustin Swanger, President of FMCC, NYCCAP liaison
   D. Swanger addressed the delegates about the focuses of the Presidents
      1. Periodic Review Reports (prr) for Middle States – Middle States will now consider taking accreditation action based on Periodic Review Reports. NYCCAP is providing some training opportunities to help prepare community college staff members as they write their Reports. They are also encouraging campuses to share their Reports for feedback prior to submitting them to Middle States.
      2. Budget – The collaboration between all the community college groups has been well coordinated and the legislature heard us. When asked about the decreasing numbers of full time faculty, D. Swanger replied that it is really annoying that at a time when we are really growing, our resources are dwindling. We need to add faculty, but we also need to balance our budgets and meet our payroll.
      3. General education – He supported a review of the current general education requirement since it’s been ten years since their inception and it’s time to see what can be revitalized.
      4. Assessment – He supported the resolution and asked System not to make the community colleges have to do something in addition to what they already have to do for Middle States and the other accreditation bodies.
      5. Questions
         Q – There is a concern about the reorganization at System and the dismissal of the Office of Community Colleges, given that the community college mission, funding and governance structure is different. Your thoughts? A - The Presidents have had the same conversation and believe that having the Office of Community Colleges is important. They are speaking respectfully but loudly because the office has been a tremendous problem solver for them. He understands that this Chancellor is trying to create a true system and he believes that she is dedicated to getting System Administration to see the whole system as a system and not view the community colleges as a stepchild.

B. David L. Mathis, Trustee at MVCC, NYCCT liaison
   D. Mathis addressed the delegates
      1. He stated that it has been a challenging year and we have to look out for what’s best for the community colleges.
      2. NYCCT has talked to Chancellor about Office of Community Colleges and she has agreed to have a summit. NYCCT believes that we need to keep
the Office of Community Colleges because the community colleges are different than the state-operated institutions.

3. NYCCT withheld support of PHEEA since there was not enough in the act about community colleges. The Chancellor missed a great opportunity to make the community colleges part of the system.

4. He believes that community colleges are still seen as second-class citizens within SUNY.

5. SUNY Community College Day sent a signal to System and the legislature, but we still need to keep the pressure on. The Trustees are looking to repeat community college day. He stated that we need to be stronger now.

6. He stated that NYCCT has not gotten the support that it needs from SUNY over the last couple of years and that as the resources continue to dry up, we will need to continue to be more active.

7. Questions and Discussion–
   Q – I wish there was someone who was keeping track of what we say we will do and what we actually do. A – Much of what was presented in the previous strategic plans were never accomplished. He stated that we lost the SUNY BoT members who were really engaged with community colleges.

C. Kenneth O’Brien, President UFS

K. O’Brien addressed the delegates

1. The January joint meeting with FCCC Executive Committee was important because we did not agree on an issue and we agreed not to agree but what came out of the discussion was a shared understanding of each other’s perspective.

2. PHEEIA – The ExComm of the UFS will be voting on a resolution on this issue on Tuesday. He believes this act will affect the community college students in that if there continues to be deep budget or resource cuts; there will be no place for community college students in the 4-year colleges.

3. Assessment – K. O’Brien believes that the one value in the assessment process is having faculty talk to each other. He welcomes the SUNY assessment resolution. He believes that it restores assessment back to the campus where it belongs and restores the relationship between the campus and external forces.

4. Strategic plan – He believes that the new strategic plan restores the “public” part of public education. The plan allows us to offer our expertise to help solve real world problems within our state.

5. He mentioned the student poster session in Albany.

6. Questions and Discussion–
   i. Q – When will the recipients of the distinguished ranks be recognized? A – There are plans for a dinner to recognize recipients in April
   ii. Q – How do you respond to idea that we make a promise to students that the community colleges will provide the first two years of their education and System will provide opportunities after that yet with
differential tuition charges, this may not be possible? A - It costs more to educate anyone at a doctoral institution than at a comprehensive college; the differential by sector makes sense and is consistent throughout the nation. K. O’Brien would have difficulty if the differentials are within sectors. He believes the act contains SUNY aid which gives to students the resources to help them to complete their degrees.

IV. Open Educational Resources and SUNY

Carey Hatch, Assistant Provost for Library and Information Services, addressed the delegates and shared a PowerPoint presentation.

Questions:

i. Q - How come this is such a great secret? A – We don’t have any mechanism for marketing to faculty. C. Hatch stated that faculty need to be evangelists.

ii. Q – How about statewide presentations to help get the word out? A – We can certainly do that. The community college librarians and MIDS are already familiar with open resources. He believes that they need to identify and showcase faculty who are already using these resources.

iii. Q – Are student interviews the type of material that could be stored in these sources? A – Yes. The problem is that the interface is not user friendly, but we’re working on this.

iv. Q – Has there been a consideration of the conflict between need to publish in a certain way for promotion and tenure and the open source resources? A – Definitely. Promotion and tenure procedures are not going to change so we are trying to work on this.

v. Q – There seems to be a conflict. If we have this open courseware or content and we’re in the business of selling our distance learning course. A – You’re not going to get the degree for free. These sources are mainly for life-long learning, but can be powerful resources for you to use within your courses.

vi. Q – There seems to be a push to teach courses in a distance learning and hybrid format because the administration believes that it is easier to teach in these environments. Any suggestions on how to combat this notion? A – Those are the conversations that we need to have with senior administrators. Technology enhanced teaching and learning will probably take more time but provides important values. Students will be expecting this; they are used to mobile learning.

vii. The presentation will be put on the Angel site.

viii. Q – Do you have any sense of the kind of savings to the students there might be if a book only appears digitally? It seems like students are simply printing their electronic texts thus passing that cost along to the school. A – 80% of the costs are in first publication. People still like that touch of the paper, but there was a change in the demographic of students this fall. More students are coming to school with netbooks and laptops.
V. Educational Pipeline Presentation and Round Table Discussion

Round Table Participants:
Johanna Duncan-Poitier, Chancellor’s Deputy for the Education Pipeline, State University of New York
Jennifer Yee, California State University, Fullerton
Eileen Abrahams, Schenectady County Community College
Charley Boyd, Genesee Community College

The participants shared PowerPoint presentations.

Questions and Discussion–

1. Q – Since one goal is to provide educators with data that tracks students’ progress through this pipeline is there a concern about student privacy? A – (J. Duncan-Poitier) There will be a P-20 data system with a unique student identifying system as currently exists in the K – 12 system. Administrators and educators want to know how many of our students are successful so that we can modify our instruction and there is a way we can get to it and still honor privacy. (J. Yee) You should ask what information is being collected, how will it be used now and in the future. There are huge implications in what is being collected and how it will be used. (J. Duncan-Poitier) No one is asking faculty what they think. In addition, data is also being collected on faculty. We have an opportunity to have a voice that has never been heard before. In order to maintain integrity, it is important to not accept money from sources that have an agenda.

2. Q – If the funding is coming from private sources, do we have to worry about what do we owe them, who will be calling the shots? SUNY has had other initiatives that we have been asked to implement and money was promised that never materialized. Where will SUNY get the money for this? A – (J. Duncan-Poitier) Foundation money is welcome.

3. Q – Remedial education seems to be a clog in pipeline. Campuses are putting a lot of resources into something that everyone acknowledges is failing. There is currently a consortium forming to look at remedial education in mathematics within two year colleges and they are looking for grant founding. We need to be in communication with someone within SUNY. Can I look to you? A – (J. Duncan-Poitier) We are looking for evidence-based initiatives. By the time a student gets to the community college, the only thing we can do is remediation. The Chancellor’s vision of the pipeline begins at birth.

4. Q – What information is being collected and for what purposes? A – (J. Duncan-Poitier) That is still being proposed. It could be used for tenure. One concern is that teachers will no longer want to teach students with issues if they are being tracked by how many students graduate etc.

5. Q – There is a problem with the pipeline metaphor. We have to recognize not every student should go to college and we will need to develop meaningful alternates for those students. A – (J. Duncan-Poitier) The definition of the pipeline is to prepare students to go to college or workforce. Students should be prepared so that they can make that choice.
VI. Luncheon Speaker
Dr. Dennis Golladay, SUNY Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, addressed the delegates.

1. D. Golladay congratulated the Council on its advocacy efforts.
2. He commented on the importance of unity and noted what the unity of the FCCC, NYCCT, NYCCAP and his office was able to accomplish.
3. Internecine elitism
   a. There is no data to support that claim that courses taught at the 4-year institution are more rigorous than those taught at the 2-year institutions.
   b. If we want to take full advantage of the national recognition of community colleges, we must unite within ourselves and not let discriminating elitism divide us. We cannot disparage our sister institutions and must stop this conversation whenever and wherever we can.
4. False dichotomy with the teaching and learning dynamic
   a. There is a unity of knowledge and learning and there is no need to draw strict divisions between teaching and learning.
   b. We should concretize the concept of unity of knowledge.
5. Workforce development
   a. No matter what we teach or how we perceive ourselves, our mission is to prepare students for productive and fulfilling careers in the workforce.
   b. There are three reasons we teach; 1) learning for learning’s sake, 2) to prepare students to take an active leadership role in society and to create an informed citizenry, and 3) to prepare students for meaningful careers.
   c. He believes that any type of learning is learning and any type of work is work and that it is all part of a unified whole.
   d. He believes that we should embrace the term, workforce development, and provide education and preparation for it at our highest levels.
6. On behalf of the FCCC, M. Johnson and T. Good thanked D. Golladay for his work on behalf of the community college constituencies during his time as Vice Chancellor.

VII. Faculty Council and ANGEL
Carey Hatch, Assistant Provost for Library and Information Services and Ann Catalano, FCCC Information Officer addressed the delegates.

1. T. Good stated that the FCCC is about to embark on a major behavioral shift from email to Angel. Angel will help the delegates to organize and find the information they need. In addition, Angel will allow the delegates to take control of the time the delegates devote to accessing this information. “Friday is FCCC day.” She is asking each delegate to devote one hour each week to FCCC and the Angel website.
2. Hatch showed the delegates the Angel home page. The FCCC website will reside in the Groups area.
3. A. Catalano walked the delegates through the various components of the FCCC Angel website. This site will make us an efficient well connected group of professionals.

4. The delegates acknowledged A. Catalano’s hard work and thanked her for her efforts.

VIII. Shared Governance Panel

Panel participants:
Maryann Faller, Adirondack Community College
Doug Garnar, Broome Community College
Donald Paulsen, North Country Community College
Lee Susice, North Country Community College

The panel shared their experiences and challenges with respect to Middle States Standard 4 – governance.

1. Adirondack had failed 4 standards during the first review. In Sept 2009, the college was reaffirmed in 3 of 4 standards, but still did not pass standard 4. In January 2010, MS found the college in compliance with standard 4 and reaffirmed their accreditation. Adirondack had to develop a whole new governance structure that had more autonomy. Under the past structure, faculty felt they had no voice in governance. The new structure has an elected executive committee and resolutions must receive a written reply as to whether they were accepted, and if not, why not. The standing committee charges were broadened to encompass all the issues that were seen over the last 10 years.

2. Broome had the same issues with governance as did Adirondack, but with different wrinkles. The President governed the school. They had created a college governance system, but it was not taken seriously. Faculty felt their voice and strength was through the union. Though a new President tried to make some use of shared governance, he didn’t bring key issues to the council. Broome used 4 rounds of surveys with students, faculty and staff to assess their present system and found that the current governance system barely existed on paper and was barely understood by the constituents on campus. The campus had a day-long convocation with T. Good and K. Reiser. The campus was cited for standard 4 due to a lack of a shared governance system, a lack of understanding on how governance operates, and confusion over how decisions are made. In addition, there seems to be no willingness of the BoT to assess themselves. D. Garnar stated that shared governance requires a cultural shift for all of the constituents. In addition, there is a need to involve younger faculty in the process.

3. Previous to the Middle States process, the administration of NCCC would make decisions, and sometimes share the results with faculty. In 2005, MS and the college signed an MOU saying that because NCCC had a curriculum committee and some semblance of an assembly, the college would be in compliance with standard 4. A task force, initiated by the union, was formed to explore what should happen with governance. Currently their assembly is composed of faculty
and non-teaching professionals. They looked at what other SUNY schools were doing and tried to hammer out what they thought was an appropriate model. They invited various constituencies in to review the chosen model. The new structure was approved but the President decided to retire. The interim president expressed hesitancy as to whether the school should adopt the new structure. With the arrival of a new President came an established shared governance organization. It is a college senate. One of its strengths is that it represents all constituencies of the college while a weakness is the fact that too many things going on right now. The college has created a bunch of task forces to address the many needs that the new President has identified. Though agenda items are put out a month in advance, there is not enough time during meetings to discuss all the items in depth. They are in better shape now than they were.

4. Questions and Discussion –
   a. Q – What resources are available should you want to write or rewrite a constitution? A – There are many resources on the FCCC website. AAUP site has a lot of assessment documents that help you determine what the characteristics of shared governance are.
   b. Q - Are the new constitutions on the FCCC web site? A - Not yet. ACC dealt with all the core issues first, but then found out some other things they wanted to look at and is currently trying to clean up some other things. Once amendments are accepted, the Constitution will be updated.
   c. Q - How do you deal with governance over multiple campuses? A - NCCC: One governance structure that has representation from all 3 campuses. Meetings are conducted over video conferences.
   d. One of thing that was learned during our process at ACC was that many of our faculty did not have an understanding of shared governance, or had very different ideas about what it means. It is important to have this discussion on your campus. The Administrative staff’s view of shared governance may be very different than the faculty perspective.
   e. T. Good stated that there is a small number of faculty who have to teach large course loads. This is a problem we have deal with and unless we deal with the reality of the lack of time and energy to participate in shared governance, we will have an ongoing struggle.
   f. Q - As full time faculty numbers decrease and adjuncts increase, our day becomes more intense. What do we do? A – (D. Garner) We need to consider if all work needs to be done by full time faculty or can we look to the adjuncts to help carry the water. Younger faculty should be able to use these types of activities to support promotion and tenure. In addition, we need to work to educate our boards.
   g. Even if we are not gaining new faculty lines, there is an infusion of new faculty on the campuses. We have to involve the new hires early on and get them to see the importance of shared governance. Suffolk created a little brochure that is directed to new faculty and staff that talks about governance, the principles of shared governance, why you would want to become a senator, etc.
h. Thank you to those who shared their stories. OCC is looking at reviewing their governance system because it is easy to end up with a real proliferation of committees, with nobody to serve on them. In hearing the stories, it helps all of us think about how to improve our governance structures. **A – (D. Garner)** Even though BCC has lots of problems, their college council has looked at some very important issues.
i. **T. Good thanked the panel.**

**VIV. Business Meeting**

A. Call to Order
T. Good called the meeting to order at 2:48 pm

B. Approval of Minutes—Fall 2009 Plenary
A motion (B. Selvek / E. Abrams) to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

C. Old Business – No old business to come before the Council

D. New Business – No new business to come before the Council.

E. President’s Report (Tina Good) – T. Good will postpone her report until tomorrow due to time constraints.

F. University-Wide Committee Reports

1. GEAR (Milton Johnson)
   a. GEAR is in the process of reviewing the final tri-annual and closing the loop reports
   b. GEAR is now disbanded and he does not foresee any reformation of this group
   c. Questions:
      i. **Q** – Will SUNY officially dissolve GEAR? **A** – It was thought that since the assessment resolution dissolved SCBA, it also dissolved GEAR but we are not sure.
      ii. **Q** – Where can I find the most recent BoT minutes and resolutions? **A** – The assessment resolution is in the delegate’s packet. You can find all minutes and resolutions on the SUNY website

2. Transfer Review Committee (TRC) (Johanna Halsey)
   a. The committee was in a “wait and see” mode until there was a campus appeal.
   b. There is currently some confusion about the relationship of the TRC and discipline panels, given that the Provost has already established discipline working groups.
c. Co-chairs of the committee have requested a meeting with the Provost and are still waiting to hear. They will re-activate the committee after that.
d. One delegate stated that it is important that the campuses have a discussion about the student appeals process so you are prepared should it happen.

3. UFS Awards Committee (Iris Cook)
a. Funding for the CID grants will be made in April. It was noted that partnering with 4-year institutions is looked upon favorably by the grants committee.
b. I. Cook reviewed the criteria for chancellor’s awards. She pointed out that although the award is limited to people in tenure track positions, a candidate only needs 3 years of experience to be considered for a Chancellor’s award. In addition, there is a new award for classified service.
c. The committee is reviewing the criteria for the distinguished ranks.
d. One delegate expressed great frustration with new process and forms and hopes that the committee will review the process.

4. UFS Governance Committee (Tom Barthel)
a. The delegate’s packet contains a written report.
b. The UFS has completed several governance orientation guides.

5. UFS Student Life Committee (Charley Boyd)
a. The committee is finishing their examination of veteran’s services and will publish the results.
b. The committee is finishing the “Traditions” booklet. Thanks to I. Cook, next year’s “Traditions 3” will include community college traditions.

6. UFS Undergraduate Committee (Art Lundahl)
a. Scholarly research poster session may become a yearly event.
b. The committee is reviewing the current Program Review guide. The committee has asked A. Lundahl if community colleges want to part of this guide or do write our own guide.
c. Q – How were campus liaisons chosen for the poster session? A – The campus CAOs appointed the contact person.

G. Information Officer’s Report (Ann Catalano)
1. The delegate’s packet contains a written report.
2. A. Catalano asked the delegates to use Angel mail to ask about a single issue but if the situation requires the response to several questions, use Survey Monkey. Contact A. Catalano to create a survey in Survey Monkey.
3. A. Catalano requested that the delegates use the forms to keep directory information up to date and to review names on listserves and send her any feedback.
H. Standing Committee Reports
1. Governance (Michael Delaney, Steve Richman) – no report

2. Academic Affairs (Art Lundahl, Kimberley Reiser) –
   Items under consideration by the committee:
   i. Program review guide
   ii. Gathering information on a common placement test

3. Student Life (Charley Boyd, Lee Susice) –
   Items under consideration by the committee:
   i. Subcommittees will be developing question for C. Hatch
   ii. Text books

4. Community College Relations (Tom Barthel, Iris Cook)
   a. The delegate’s packet contains a written report.
   b. The delegates were requested to encourage their campuses to
      participate in the Chancellor’s Distinguished Awards.
   c. Electronic newsletter – M. Johnson
      i. The newsletter is currently in development and once published the
         delegates are requested to distribute it to other members on their
         campuses.
      ii. The newsletter will contain an awards section, comings and goings
          section, op. ed. pieces, summaries of plenaries, etc
      iii. The anticipated roll out of the newsletter is April.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm

VI. Dinner Presentation

Dr. Robert B. Jubenville was presented with the 2010 Distinguished Service Award.
(Appendix F)

Saturday, March 27
I. Business Meeting—Regency Ballroom
   I. Call to Order
T. Good called the meeting to order at 10:33 am

II. Old Business

There was no old business to come before the Council.

III. New Business

There was no new business to come before the Council
IV. FCCC Committee Reports and Resolutions

A. Academic Affairs (Art Lundahl, Kimberley Reiser)

1. Common Placement Test
   a. The committee had decided to suspend our information gathering on common placement test initiative.
   b. T. Good shared that the Vice Chancellor had asked her to recommend 3 names to work on a task force on this issue.
   c. K. Reiser noted that we could definitely solicit members for this task force but she wondered whether this was a real focus of System or simply a last “hurrah” for the Vice Chancellor. She suggested that T. Good investigate this.
   d. T. Good pointed out that this issue is part of the educational pipeline
   e. Several members volunteered: M. Murphy, Anna from TC3, C. Boyd volunteered. In addition, J. Halsey, M. Delaney and A. Turin can recommend a person from each of their campuses.

2. Grades for Transfer
   a. It was thought that the Provost had cleared up this issue to our satisfaction. He stated that courses with a grade of C or higher are guaranteed to transfer but receiving institutions may opt to accept a lower grade.
   b. The committee felt that there is still some confusion about what grades will transfer. They asked T. Good to ask the Provost to refine and clarify his interpretation and implementation of the BoT resolution; to clarify and distribute some implementation guidelines that are vetted through faculty governance. In addition, the committee asks that once the language is developed that it be put on the website. The committee felt that it was important for the students to have this information.
   c. It was pointed out that there are many schools that leave the interpretation of a C to the instructor. K. Reiser thought that it would be valuable to collect this information via a survey.

3. Program review –
   a. The committee will start with a questionnaire to our campuses to identify problems with the current process.

4. Resolution Requesting Review of SUNY General Education Requirement (Appendix A)
   a. Art summarized the resolution
   b. A motion was made (Committee/D. Garner) to approve the resolution.
   c. Discussion
      i. When asked about the result of the committee review, A. Lundahl responded that the BoT should make a resolution to amend or change the current GER requirement.
      ii. It was pointed out that the current draft of the resolution does not say that and it was recommended that the recommendations should come out of the task force. There was a concern about the resolution containing these types of assumptions.
iii. There was a discussion about amending the resolution to include reviewing GER and making a recommendation.

iv. One delegate stated that after reading the report, the FCCC should make the recommendations.

v. One delegate wondered if the resolution was implying that whatever the task force comes up with should be formally shared with the FCCC and UFS.

vi. A friendly amendment, to change the wording to “review and report on” was accepted.

vii. When K. Reiser asked T. Good how she felt about the sol part of the resolution, T. Good responded that she would suggest that the Council should consider whether the language is strong enough. The FCCC has a position that we do not ever accept externally imposed sloes.

viii. S. Richman made a friendly amendment “to review and report on the appropriateness of maintaining (changed to including by another friendly amendment by K. Reiser) sloes associated with “which was accepted.

ix. A motion to call the question (S. Richman/ I. Cook) carried.

x. The motion to approve the resolution as amended passed unanimously.

5. Resolution endorsing the SUNY Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment of March 23, 2010 (Appendix B)
   i. K. Reiser read proposed resolution
   ii. A motion (committee/ C. Boyd) to approve the resolution passed unanimously

6. When asked if the delegates should take these resolutions back to their campuses as an FYI or should they ask for campus support, T. Good replied that the FCCC acts for the campuses and has the legal authority to act on their behalf.

B. Student Life (Charley Boyd, Lee Susice)
The committee will be working on the following items.

1. Success of transfer students
   a. The committee is still concerned about the success rate of the community college students who transfer to 4 year schools.
   b. They are hoping to establish liaison status with NYSTA.
   c. The committee wants to identify the best practices of 2 yr and 4 yr colleges on this issue and then create a panel presentation for the next NYSTA meeting.

2. The committee will create a survey about open education resources which they will review at fall plenary.

3. The committee will continue to follow up on textbook issues.

4. The committee will continue to investigate the education pipeline.

5. One of the delegates suggested the committee look into the viability of day care centers. The committee chairs thought was a good item for the committee to investigate.
C. Community College Relations (Tom Barthel, Iris Cook)
Delegates were asked to provide information about items on their campuses for inclusion in the upcoming newsletter.

D. Governance (Michael Delaney, Steve Richman)
1. Resolution on the Establishment of a Work Group on Shared Governance within SUNY (Appendix C)
   a. Since the resolution supported a letter written to the Chancellor on this topic by the presidents of the FCCC and UFS, the committee chairs shared that letter with the delegates. T. Good gave some context to the charge described in the letter and stated that this letter has already been submitted to Chancellor and has been shared with her cabinet but the Chancellor has yet to respond.
   b. A motion to support the resolution was made. (Committee/D. Garner)
   c. Discussion –
      i. When asked about the membership of the work group, T. Good replied that the membership was suggested by the Chancellor and agreed to by K. O'Brien and herself.
      ii. When asked about the use of the term “working group” since it is not a shared governance term, T. Good replied that there are currently two sets of processes going on at System; the strategic planning process and the infrastructure process. The Chancellor has working groups involved in those. Since governance is in the infrastructure process, she decided to use the same term.
      iii. It was requested that the charge written by the Presidents be on the Angel site.
      iv. A motion to call the question (K. Reiser/ B. Selvek) passed.
      v. The motion to approve the resolution passed unanimously.
2. Lack of proper governance procedure for determining discipline groups with respect to student mobility.
   a. The committee is currently working on a formal resolution to address this issue.
   b. T. Good provided the delegates with background on the issue.
      i. The Provost’s office and staff has identified 50 transfer majors which make up 90 – 95% of all transfers.
      ii. Within these majors, they have attempted to identify 3 to 5 core courses that are required in the first two years of the baccalaureate degree.
      iii. If the Provost’s office can easily identify these courses, they will send course descriptions, taken from the campuses’ websites, to the discipline specific faculty at those institutions with the highest number of sending and receiving transfer students. Feedback from these faculty will go to a discipline working group which will develop a “system wide” description of the course. This description will go on the transfer website. All courses that map to
the description, as determined by the individual campuses, go on the website and transfer. If there is a problem with a course transferring, the rejection of that course can be appealed through the TRC.

iv. If the Provost’s office has trouble identifying the 3 to 5 courses, they will facilitate a meeting of the faculty from those institutions with the highest number of sending and receiving transfer students in order to identify those courses.

v. If there is a problem with identifying core course descriptors then the discipline groups to detail the course descriptors and, if necessary, produce a template.

vi. The Provost’s office is not mandating that campuses change their curriculums but will guarantee transfer into the major of any identified course taken by the student.

vii. The issue at the moment is with the lack of faculty governance in the process and the timing of the process.

c. K. Reiser stated that what is happening at the moment is in direct contradiction to what is stated in the resolution by the Joint Committee on Transfer and Articulation. S. Richman responded that the Provost believes that he followed the resolution on 95% of the courses and that it was only with the problem courses that he didn’t follow resolution.

d. D. Garner asked about the time frame for the remaining for the programs and suggested that T. Good have a conversation with the Provost about the timing of the process. In addition he suggested that the Provost’s office use the CAOs instead of the transfer articulation office as the point person.

e. K. Reiser reviewed the history of student mobility. She stated that the BoT required the Joint Committee to develop implementation guidelines before they would approve the resolution. She stated that the committee created the guidelines but the BoT has chosen not to use them. T. Good replied that she doubted that the BoT ever saw the implementation guidelines.

f. S. Gerheim-Seppa pointed out that not every community college sends students to SUNY schools and the present process limits participation in the conversation to those who send their students to SUNY.

g. M. Delaney stated that the final resolution written by the committee will highlight the following issues
   i. The lack of governance involvement in whole process. The resolution will ask the Provost to sit down with the presidents of the FCCC and UFS to discuss ways to involve faculty governance.
   ii. The need for better communication
   iii. The concern about the discipline committees becoming too overly prescriptive by including such things as sloes, grading rubrics, etc in the template. This is in response to the Suffolk Ammerman Senate resolution.
h. S. Richman stated that the committee will communicate via email and when the resolution is finalized. He will call for an electronic vote. In addition, he publically thanked all the cgl's for all their help.

E. Ad hoc Workforce Development –
M. Murphy read a prepared statement. (Appendix D)

V. **Budget Report (Johanna Halsey)**
J. Halsey presented the budget report. "Life is good." T. Good thanked J. Halsey for all the work she had done (Appendix E)

VI. **Elections**

1. President-elect
   S. Richman put T. Good's name into nomination for this position and opened the floor to nomination. After receiving no further nominations, a motion to close the nominations (A. Catalano/ C. Boyd) passed and the secretary cast one vote in support of T. Good as President-elect

2. Vice President/Treasurer
   S. Richman put M. Murphy's name into nomination for this position and opened the floor to nomination. After receiving no further nominations, a motion to close the nominations (B. Selvek / M. Delaney) passed and the secretary cast one vote in support of M. Murphy as Vice President/Treasurer

3. Secretary
   S. Richman put M. Faller's name into nomination for this position and opened the floor to nomination. After receiving no further nominations, a motion to close the nominations (B. Selvek/ C. Boyd) passed and the secretary cast one vote in support of M. Faller for Secretary.

VII. **Future Meetings**

A. Fall 2010 Plenary—Corning Community College - October 28-30, 2010


VIII. **Good of the Order**

1. I. Cook introduced a resolution for the good of the order in recognition of R. Axelrod’s years of service to the Council. (Appendix G)

2. T. Good publically thanked C. Burnham for all her work in making the plenary run smoothly.

3. I. Cook introduced a resolution expressing thanks and appreciation to M. Delaney, H. Cruz, ECC, etc. (Appendix H)

4. I. Cook introduced a resolution in recognition of T. Good’s work during this plenary. (Appendix I)
IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm

Respectfully submitted;

Maryann B. Faller

Secretary
Appendices
Appendix A
Resolution Requesting Review of SUNY General Education Requirement (GER)
FCCC Resolution #AA3: 2009-10

WHEREAS, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges participated in the development of SUNY General Education requirements through its involvement with the SUNY Joint Task Force on General Education in 1998, and

WHEREAS, the SUNY Board of Trustees established university wide requirements in Resolution 98-241 in December 1998, and

WHEREAS, the faculty of SUNY community colleges have made significant contributions to the implementation, assessment, and review of this requirement through participation in the Provosts Advisory Task Force on General Education (PACGE), the Advisory Council on General Education (ACGE), the General Education Assessment Review Group (GEAR), and Strengthened Campus Based Assessment (SCBA) development and implementation, and

WHEREAS, SUNY General Education requirements have a concurrent relationship and direct impact on student mobility, and

WHEREAS, amendments to the SUNY General Education Requirement (GER) were adopted in SUNY Trustees Resolution 2010-006, and

WHEREAS, best assessment practices support timely review of SUNY GER, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges encourages the university provost to further enhance our System’s excellence by initiating a review of its present general education requirements through the creation of a Task Force which provides broad system representation including faculty governance, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Task Force review and report on the efficacy of maintaining the existing ten knowledge and skills areas and two infused competencies, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Task Force review and report on the appropriateness of including student learning outcomes associated with those requirements.

Approved 3/27/10
Appendix B

Resolution Endorsing the SUNY Board of Trustees Resolution on Streamlining the State University Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment
Dated March 23, 2010
FCCC Resolution #AA2: 2009-10
Adopted March 27, 2010

WHEREAS, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges has been an advocate for the streamlining of SUNY assessment initiatives, particularly the elimination of duplicative assessment activities by campuses, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges Resolution AA1 2009-2010 of October 2009 endorsed the recommendations of the Provost Advisory Group on the SUNY Assessment Initiative, and

WHEREAS, SUNY System Administration demonstrated the use of sound shared governance principles by soliciting and incorporating feedback from faculty governance during the streamlining of the State University Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges supports the streamlining of State University Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the FCCC will work with the Provost’s office in the formation of the Assessment Advisory Group.

Approved 3/27/2010
Appendix C

Resolution on the Establishment of a Work Group on Shared Governance within SUNY
FCCC Resolution #G1-2009-10
March 27, 2010

WHEREAS, SUNY has long recognized the importance of shared governance, and
WHEREAS, the Presidents of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges and the
University Faculty Senate have requested the establishment of a Work Group on
Shared Governance within SUNY with the attached charge and suggested membership
(see below),

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges
endorses the attached charge and suggested membership for the proposed SUNY
Work Group on Shared Governance, and be it further

Resolved, that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges requests the establishment
of the SUNY Work Group on Shared Governance.

Approved 3/27/2010

Charge for Work Group on Shared Governance within SUNY

Charge:
The work group will examine the current patterns and procedures for shared governance at SUNY
System Administration, conduct research for recommending foundational documents and policies and
processes to strengthen effective shared governance, and will make recommendations regarding the
most appropriate policies and procedures for effective shared governance at SUNY System
Administration. Additionally, this Work Group will recommend tactical strategies for encouraging shared
governance at the campus level as well.

Rationale:
Strong shared governance within higher education is recognized as necessary for maintaining vital
institutions within a democracy. As the Middle State’s Commission on Higher Education explains in its
standard on “Leadership and Governance,” it “expects a climate of shared collegial governance in
which all constituencies (such as faculty, administration, staff, students and governing board
members, as determined by each institution) involved in carrying out the institution’s mission and goals
participate in the governance function in a manner appropriate to that institution. Institutions should
seek to create a governance environment in which issues concerning mission, vision, program planning,
resource allocation and others, as appropriate, can be discussed openly by those who are responsible
for each activity. Within any system of shared governance, each major constituency must carry out its
separate but complementary roles and responsibilities. Each must contribute to an appropriate degree
so that decision-makers and goal-setters consider information from all relevant constituencies. While
reflecting institutional mission, perspective, and culture, collegial governance structures should
acknowledge also the need for timely decision-making.” It is important, therefore, that SUNY System Administration assist campuses in meeting this standard by creating a culture of shared governance and serving as a model of best practices in shared governance processes.

Suggested Membership for Work Group on Shared Governance:

The Chancellor (or designee)
The Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (or designee)
The Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officers (or designee)
The President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges
The President of the Student Assembly
The President of the University Faculty Senate
The Convener of Campus Governance Leaders from the UFS
A Campus Governance Leader from the Community Colleges

Appendix D
Faculty Council of Community Colleges
ad hoc Committee on Workforce Development
Charge March 2010

This Committee recognizes, in the best interest of students, the importance of an academic experience that is not dictated by the business world, it also recognizes the need to build relationships with business leaders that allows for the two way transmission of information.

With the shift in available jobs and the constant reinvention of careers, students need readily available career information. Equally important is the need for student information on the myriad of career possibilities that are often overlooked. Students also need to hear from business leaders – not just advisors and professors -- the importance of soft skills – critical thinking, and written and oral communication – as well as the technical skills pertinent to the career fields.

To this end, the Committee will explore the opportunities for the exchange of information among students, professors, college career and academic advisors, and business leaders.

The Committee will attend a state wide career center conference in June and participate in several web conferences with business, work force development and SUNY administration representatives.
The Committee will also seek information on how many professional degree programs at community colleges work with external advisory committees made up of local business leaders. The Committee will work to involve liberal arts faculty members in these advisory committees as liaisons as a way to increase the flow of information among, professional degree program professors, liberal arts professors, and business leaders who all share a responsibility to the success of students.

Committee Members: Richard Balestrino, Fashion Institute, Barbara Drado, SUNY Systems Liaison, Margaret Murphy, Monroe Community College, Anita Schmidt, Ulster Community College, Melissa Schmidt, Thompson Community College

Appendix F

Whereas he has devoted more than thirty-five years to SUNY’s Mohawk Valley Community College helping it become what it is today, And
Whereas he has served as a Faculty member, Department Head, and Dean, assuming roles of responsibility and worth, And
Whereas his leadership and wisdom have inspired and supported legions of students, faculty and his peers, And
Whereas he has dedicated more than twenty years to the mission and function of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, And
Whereas his work with the FCCC has been on of the highest level of responsibility, and comprehensive activity, And
Whereas through his work with the Council, he became part of many SUNY-wide Committees and Task Forces working in the larger academic community, and influencing the direction of the University while benefitting all of its students, And
Whereas his work has been acknowledged with Excellence in Service Awards by SUNY Chancellor, Mohawk Valley Community College and the National Council of Instructional Administrators, And
Whereas his life of dedication to higher education and community colleges reveals the true passion and commitment of a generous an wise colleague, Therefore,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Council of Community Colleges bestows the 2010 Distinguished Service Award on Dr. Robert B. Jubenville, in recognition of his illustrious contributions and activities on behalf of all community colleges, his service to the State University of New York and his considerable impact on higher education in New York State.

March 26, 2010
Appendix G

Wheras he has given his all – time, talent, charm, leadership and friendship,
And
Whereas after 18 years, our former President and distinguished delegate, Robert Axelrod, is bidding us adieu,
Therefore
Be is resolved that it is appropriate and fitting that the FCCC express its deepest thanks and good cheer to Bob as he flies off to live the rest of his life without us.
Hail fellow – well met and cherished friend.
Farewell!
Fare – thee – well!
And
Bob, thanks for the memories.

Appendix H

Whereas the Spring 2010 FCCC meeting drew us all to Buffalo –Yeah!
And
Whereas Buffalo is the
Best
Useful
Folk
Friendly
Location
Overall,
And
Whereas Buffalo is home to the Bills, the Bisons, the hot wing, hot sauce, bologna steaks, the cooling action of the Sabers and Kemmelweck rolls dressed with crunchy salt and caraway seeds,
And
Whereas our hosts provided comfort, dazzling dinners, a sultry sommelier and soul-rocking entertainment,
And
Whereas we leave with spirits lifted, friendships formed and renewed and amazingly, much business accomplished,
Therefore
Be it resolved that the FCCC expresses its deepest thanks and appreciation to Michael Delaney and his worker bees, Ann and Heather, President Jack Quinn, the students of Erie’s Culinary Arts program and Erie Community College for a
Big
Upbeat
Fun
Fest
And
Lovely
Opportunity
Presented to all at this plenary of the FCCC in March of 2010.
Appendix I
Whereas, she has done it again!

Big
Unified
Focused
Forum-
Authentic
Lively and
Organized
And

Whereas her leadership, personal style, intellect and passion for the FCCC is always present and provocative,
Therefore

Be it resolved that the delegates of the FCCC express great appreciation and admiration to President Tina Good who is truly good, for an excellent March 2010 plenary meeting.