

NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Garden City, New York 11530

Board of Trustees Policy & Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

December 10, 2024

The meeting of the Policy & Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees was held in the College Center Building Room 252-253. The meeting was called to order by Trustee Weiss at 6:25 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Kathy Weiss, Chair
Jordon Groom
Lynne D'Agostino
Donna Tuman
Jorge Gardyn (ex-officio)

Also in Attendance: Elliot Conway, John DeGrace, John Durso
CAO Conzatti, General Counsel Haugen,

1. Approval of Minutes

Trustee Weiss requested a motion to approve the minutes of November 12, 2024. Trustee Tuman moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Groom. Motion carried 4-0.

2. Discussion of Policy 7900 Animals on Campus

Trustee Weiss started the discussion by stating that the purpose of the policy is to ensure the health and safety of everyone on campus, the necessity of which has been prompted by a recent incident in which a student brought a dog into a meeting. Trustee Groom commented that he looked at a lot of other college policies and thinks we should explicitly affirm compliance with New York State code and regulations. Ms. Haugen explained that we are not a SUNY school and, hence, this law does not apply since we are not considered a state agency, adding that we are, however, in compliance with the ADA. Trustee Conway suggested stipulating "as applicable with Nassau County laws". Trustee Groom added that the policy does not explicitly protect the wildlife, as it is extremely broad. Ms. Haugen replied that the policy does protect wildlife, but all animals and pets are prohibited from the College's internal buildings. Trustee Weiss requested a motion to Policy 7900 to the full Board for a first reading. Trustee Tuman moved the motion; seconded by Chair Gardyn. Motion carried 3-0-1(Groom).

3. Discussion of Policy 4300 Student Credit Contact hours.

Trustee Weiss asked if there were any comments on Policy 4300 since there was a preview at the Academic, Student Affairs and Enrollment committee meeting. Trustee Groom objected that he believes it is inappropriate to discuss the policy without it going through the proper committee.

Trustee Tuman added that it is very important that the institution is in compliance with the number of credit hours as outlined in the state curriculum guidelines. Further, at most universities, these credit hours are actually specified on the syllabi along with the number of contact hours, and not only in classroom or through other outside work, such as research or "homework hours", which should be stated on syllabi as part of our responsibility to the students so they understand what is their commitment. She is concerned if any divergence in the number of credit hours with those stated as contact hours with the faculty is not made clear to the students and asked specifically why the policy was created?

VP Alvarez-Ortiz explained that in preparing for Middle States, one of the items we are obligated to have a formal credit contact policy demonstrating how courses are created. We follow SUNY's guidelines, but we do not have any specific instructions on how we create our courses, how we identify lectures and labs, and how we apply the credits. After a discussion with Cabinet, the hiring of an outside consultant was approved to analyze the reports generated by the Banner system in regard to credit/contact hours. The report was shared with ASEC

with the goal of inviting the CWCC to review and to provide constructive input. However, the committee decided not to engage the matter. The firm completed its work at the end of October and the committee received the report soon after. In regards to Trustee Groom's question that the policy did not go through CWCC is because the Senate rescinded the charge. VP Alvarez-Ortiz noted that the application of credit contact hours is an administrative matter rather than a curriculum issue. She deferred to Mr. Paulson twice for further insights on the financial aspects. The consulting firm highlighted several discrepancies and found no justification for how contact hours were applied to a course.

Trustee Weiss voiced her concern that the report was received on December 6th, which did not allow enough time for her to delve into it thoroughly, such as to research which courses would not transfer; and there needs to be a discussion on the financial piece. In her view, an accrediting agency wants to see you working on things and have the level of input from the faculty. She supports the need to figure out how to substantiate the course/credit hours, but she will make a motion to table Policy 4300.

Trustee Tuman commented that one standard contact hour equates to 50 minutes and, although there might be some gray area or wiggle room with studio and labs, in her experience, this calculation has been straightforward and aligns with the chart. She is concerned how we can justify changing what she thinks are considered standard contact hours for faculty and students.

Trustee D'Agostino asked how is this policy different from what is in place now and does it affect scheduling classes? Trustee Groom believes this measure is much more than the SUNY standard and these classes would not transfer. VP Alvarez-Ortiz disagreed and said the issue is there is inconsistency in our courses and no rationale how we created classes. For example, if a 4-credit class allocates 7 contact hours to the faculty, there is no documentation to justify this allocation. Our focus has always been on the academic aspects, and we have not previously examined this issue from a procedural standpoint or considered whether we can financially sustain this practice.

Trustee Groom stated that, according to the audit, courses will be separated by lab and lecture classes, which seems insane from a student perspective. He offered an illustration: for a lab which is 3 contact hours for the instructor, it is 2 hours of homework time or 1 credit of in-class time that is paired with a lecture, which is 3 credits and 2 hours of out-of-class time, and now we are asking for $6 + 2 = 8$. VP Alvarez-Ortiz replied that, in the example he has given, we are identifying what is a lecture and what is a lab, and the student can register for the lecture under one CRN and then for the lab under another CRN, so even though they are for the same course, the lecture and lab class sections are delineated. Trustee Groom inquired whether students will be registering for 2 classes that are the same course? Trustee Weiss suggested to Trustee Groom that he has legitimate questions to ask the Curriculum Committee before bringing them to the Policy and Planning Committee, because how students register is an administrative function.

Trustee Weiss made a motion to table Policy 4300, and asked for a second?

Trustee Tuman seconded the motion to table Policy 4300, adding that the Board be provided clarity in comparing the policy with those of other universities and community colleges in terms of their guidelines and that they put forward. Motion carried 4-0.

Trustee Weiss asked if there were any other items for the Committee to consider. There being none, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne E. Brandi

Secretary to the President and the
Board of Trustees