

NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
Garden City, New York

BOARD OF TRUSTEES' MINUTES

Meeting of November 10, 2015

The five hundred ninetieth meeting of the Board of Trustees was held on Tuesday, November 10, 2015 on the eleventh floor of the Administrative Tower.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Gardyn at 7:05 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

**Present:** Jorge L. Gardyn, Chair  
Kathy Weiss, Vice Chair  
Arnold W. Drucker, Secretary;  
Anthony W. Cornachio, John A. DeGrace,  
Wanda Jackson, Jennifer Borzym, Student Trustee.

**Absent:** Edward W. Powers, Donna Tuman.

Also in attendance: Interim President Dolan, EVP Saunders

Chair Gardyn requested a motion that pursuant to Section 105 of the Open Meetings Law of the State of New York, the Board of Trustees shall enter Executive Session for the following purposes: 1) matters relating to potential litigation with the NCCFT; 2) matters relating to negotiations with the AFA; 3) matters leading to the proposed litigation with respect to the CSEA; and 4) of reviewing the medical, financial, credit or employment history of a particular person or corporation, or matters leading to the appointment, employment, promotion, demotion, discipline, suspension, dismissal or removal of a particular person or corporation. Trustee DeGrace moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Jackson.

A discussion was held on the motion.

Trustee Cornachio: This board has consistently gone into executive session and consistently violated the law. We go in under the pretext of statutory permissibility of section 105 of the public officers law and we wind up talking about things that are not permissible and, therefore, I vote against going into executive session and if we do go into executive session, I intend to take notes and I intend to seek relief in court if there is any violation, and there will be.

Dr. Dolan: I did propose to the board seven items I hope to discuss in executive session tonight. I promise before we do each and every one of those, I will check with the board to ascertain whether or not it feels it is an appropriate item for executive session.

Trustee Cornachio: It is not what the board feels, Tom; it is what the law is.

Dr. Dolan: Well the Board means what is lawful.

Trustee Cornachio: O.K. It will be reviewed by a court; I can promise you that.

The vote was taken and the motion to go into executive session carried 6-1 (Cornachio opposed).

Chair Gardyn resumed the open meeting at 8:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Present: Jorge L. Gardyn, Chair  
Kathy Weiss, Vice Chair  
Arnold W. Drucker, Secretary;  
Anthony W. Cornachio, John A. DeGrace,  
Wanda Jackson, Jennifer Borzym, Student Trustee.

**Absent:** Edward W. Powers, Donna Tuman.

Also in attendance: Interim President Dolan, EVP Saunders

Approval of Minutes

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to approve the minutes of October 13, 2015. Trustee Drucker moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Weiss. Motion carried 7-0.

1. Trustee Weiss introduced the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, THAT THE NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES APPROVES THE PENDING COLLEGE PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT WITH VIRTUAL LOGISTICS INSTITUTE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$159,782.00.

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to consider this item. Trustee Weiss moved the motion; seconded by Trustee DeGrace. Motion carried 7-0.

2. Trustee Borzym introduced the following resolution:

**BE IT RESOLVED** THE NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES DOES HEREBY AUTHORIZE INTERIM PRESIDENT THOMAS P. DOLAN TO SIGN ON BEHALF OF THE COLLEGE, AS PURCHASER, A CONTRACT OF SALE WITH RESPECT TO THE PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED AS SECTION 44 BLOCK F PART OF LOT 408 LOCATED SOUTH OF THE LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD TRACKS WITHIN THE MITCHEL FIELD HOUSING COMPLEX IN THE TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK TO THE COUNTY OF NASSAU.

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to consider this item. Trustee Weiss moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Drucker. Motion carried 7-0.

3. Trustee DeGrace introduced the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, THAT THE RENTAL FEE BE WAIVED FOR USE OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S COLLEGE CENTER BUILDING AND G BUILDING FOR THE 2016 BI-ANNUAL NEW JERSEY NEW YORK ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICES CONFERENCE, SCHEDULED ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2016 AND BE IT

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, THAT ALL ASSOCIATED PERSONNEL AND MAINTENANCE COSTS WILL BE BORNE BY THE COLLEGE.

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to consider this item. Trustee Jackson moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Cornachio. Motion carried 7-0.

4. Trustee Jackson introduced the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, THAT IN RECOGNITION OF DISTINGUISHED AND MERITORIOUS SERVICE TO NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE FOLLOWING NAMED RETIRED FACULTY MEMBERS OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE WHO RETIRED AFTER ATTAINING THE ACADEMIC RANK OF PROFESSOR OR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ARE HEREBY GRANTED THE PERMANENT ACADEMIC TITLE OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS WITH ALL THE PRIVILEGES AND RIGHTS ACCRUING THERETO.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Retirement Date</u>
Sharon Abramson	Professor	Math/Computer Science/IT	9/1/15
Richard Ashker	Professor	Student Personnel Services	9/1/15
Cynthia Bayern	Professor	Psychology	9/1/15
Sammy Browne	Professor	English	9/1/15
Qiong-Ying Chen	Associate Professor	Reading/BEP	9/1/15
Lawrence Dellaquila	Professor	HPER	9/1/15
Susan Dooley	Professor	Art	9/1/15
Adam Haridopolos	Professor	English	9/1/15
Barbara Horn	Professor	English	9/1/15
Alice Jones	Associate Professor	Allied Health Sciences	9/1/15
Alan Kupfer	Professor	English	9/1/15
Barbara Levy	Associate Professor	Reading/BEP	9/1/15
Edward Mack	Associate Professor	HPER	9/1/15
Baruch May	Professor	Biology	9/1/15
George Miller	Professor	Math/Computer Science/IT	9/1/15
Meta Plotnik	Professor	English	9/1/15
Lawrence Salpeter	Associate Professor	Psychology	9/1/15
Eric Schafler	Associate Professor	Hospitality	9/1/15

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to consider this item. Trustee DeGrace moved the motion; seconded by Trustee Drucker. Motion carried 7-0.

5. Chair Gardyn made a motion under Article IV section 3(f) of the Rules of Procedure to allow for the consideration of an item that does not appear on the Calendar. Trustee DeGrace seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Trustee Cornachio introduced the following resolution on Multiple Measures as approved by the Academic Affairs Committee meeting:

**WHEREAS**, THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE VOTED IN RESPONSE TO AN APPEAL FROM THE VETO RENDERED BY THE THEN ACTING PRESIDENT ON MAY 1, 2015 RESPECTING CERTAIN ACTION BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE TAKEN ON APRIL 21, 2015 REGARDING THE ISSUE OF MULTIPLE MEASURES IN STUDENT PLACEMENT TESTING, AND

**WHEREAS**, THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES IN RESPONSE TO SAID APPEAL IN A DECISION DATED JUNE 9, 2015 DIRECTED “. . . THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE ADMINISTRATION TO RECONCILE THEIR RESPECTIVE DIFFERENCES THAT EXIST WITH RESPECT TO THE MULTIPLE MEASURES IN PLACEMENT TESTING, AND THAT THIS BOARD BE PROVIDED WITH A CONSENSUS BY THE NOVEMBER 2015 MEETING WHICH IS WITH THE CONSENT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. IF NO CONSENSUS IS REACHED, THE BOARD WILL THEN BE AUTHORIZED TO RENDER A DECISION ON THE VETO" (OF THE EARLIER ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION RELATING TO MULTIPLE MEASURES)", AND

**WHEREAS**, A CONSENSUS BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN REACHED WITH RESPECT TO PLACEMENT TESTING FOR READING AND ENGLISH AS SET FORTH IN THE "*CONSENSUS STATEMENT RESPECTING PLACEMENT TESTING FOR READING AND ENGLISH*" ATTACHED HERETO, AND

**WHEREAS**, NO SUCH CONSENSUS BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN REACHED WITH RESPECT TO MULTIPLE MEASURES IN PLACEMENT TESTING FOR MATHEMATICS, AND

**WHEREAS**, THE BOARD'S RESOLUTION OF JUNE 9, 2015 STATED THAT "IF NO CONSENSUS IS REACHED, THE BOARD WILL THEN BE AUTHORIZED TO RENDER A DECISION ON THE VETO,"

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, THAT THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE DOES HEREBY AFFIRM THE CONSENSUS AGREEMENT REACHED BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND THE ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO PLACEMENT TESTING FOR READING AND ENGLISH, SET FORTH AT LENGTH IN THE "*CONSENSUS STATEMENT RESPECTING PLACEMENT TESTING FOR READING AND ENGLISH*", AND

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, THAT THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE DOES HEREBY DIRECT THAT WITH RESPECT TO THE PLACEMENT TESTING FOR MATHEMATICS THAT THE INTERIM PRESIDENT SHALL PROMULGATE A "*COLLEGE STATEMENT RESPECTING PLACEMENT TESTING FOR MATHEMATICS*", WHICH SHALL CONSTITUTE THE POLICY OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND SUCH POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED POST HASTE BY THE INTERIM PRESIDENT UPON SUCH PROMULGATION, AND

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, THAT THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE DOES HEREBY DIRECT THAT THE "*CONSENSUS STATEMENT RESPECTING PLACEMENT TESTING FOR READING AND ENGLISH*", BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE INTERIM PRESIDENT POST HASTE, WHICH STATEMENT SHALL CONSTITUTE THE POLICY OF NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

Seconded by Trustee Weiss. Motion carried 7-0.

*(Statements Attached)*

6. Election of Officers

Chair Gardyn made a motion to table the Election of Officers. Seconded by Trustee DeGrace. Motion defeated 2, yea (Gardyn, DeGrace) - 5 nay (Cornachio, Drucker, Jackson, Weiss, Borzym).

The Board of Trustees of Nassau Community College conducted a vote for election of officers during the public session. The vote for Vice Chair: Trustee Tuman 2 (DeGrace, Gardyn) and Trustee Weiss 5 (Cornachio, Drucker, Jackson, Weiss, Borzym). The vote for Chair: Chair Gardyn 3 (DeGrace, Gardyn, Borzym) and Trustee Weiss 4 (Cornachio, Drucker, Jackson, Weiss). No trustees garnered the necessary six votes for the office of chair and vice chair. There will be a revote for Chair and Vice Chair at their next scheduled Board meeting.

Dr. Dolan reported on the following items:

- The NCC Foundation held its Gala on November 6<sup>th</sup> which was a huge success and thanked Joy DeDonato and her staff for all their efforts.
- Middle States team is scheduled for March 13-16, 2016. Dr. Generals, Team Chair, met with a number of groups on November 9. Dr. Generals was pleased with the submitted report and felt NCC is ready for the team visit in March 2016.
- Events Celebrating Veterans Day on campus.
- Kathleen Rice recommended that NCC have a VSOCc, Veterans Success on Campus counselor, on campus along with Congressmen Zeldin, King and Israel. They have all petitioned the Association of Veterans Affairs Administration for that to happen; it would be a wonderful resource for NCC to have on campus.
- Open House is scheduled for Sunday, November 15, 2015.
- Congratulated Chuck Cutolo on his retirement in January. At the Foundation Gala, Ed Mangano, who was being honored, pointed at Chuck in the audience and acknowledged all that he had accomplished and thanked him for all the work that he had done previously in legislative roles but specifically for the way that he has represented the college at the county level, petitioned for us, fought for us, and has done a lot of good work in that role and many others. At this time, Chuck Cutolo's position will be vacated.
- All new hiring positions will be evaluated very carefully moving forward.
- The last two retirement incentives and the efforts being taken to determine which of the 106 faculty lines will be replaced. Dr. Saunders is working with the deans and will soon be working with the chairs to determine what positions are actually necessary to be filled.

The following discussion took place:

Mr. Cornachio: I thought you wanted to go into whether we should hire administrators.

Dr. Dolan: Well, what I said was I will be seeking the direction of the board on what we will do relative to Mr. Cutolo's position and his responsibilities. If you want to weigh in now, that will be fine with me, and I am all ears.

Mr. Cornachio: Frankly, as I am considering the financial picture--why should I always be talking first?

Dr. Dolan: I don't know.

Mr. Cornachio: Dr. Weiss? Because I've got a big mouth. Dr. Weiss, you have a little mouth. Why don't you say something?

Dr. Weiss: I don't know if I should take that as an insult or a compliment. My position is, and I certainly value all of what Mr. Cutolo has done for the college. But as I listened to the fiscal report during the Finance Committee meeting and saw all of the lines with negative brackets around them, I think that we have to look at, as you just said, Dr. Dolan, all of the hiring. And I don't think just because somebody is leaving that we have to or should replace that position. I think we have an obligation as we look at not filling some of our faculty positions, full-time faculty, that we look at not filling administrative positions. I think we have to look at administrative positions and decide if we need all of them, because in this fiscal time, we've got to cut, and I

think we have to cut at all lines, not just one set of lines. So yeah, I think we need to take a look at the responsibilities that fit under Mr. Cutolo, see if there are other people whom we've hired who could accept some of those responsibilities, change other people's jobs. I don't know. I'm not going to be the administrator about this, but I do think, in light of our fiscal, we need to think 100 times before we replace positions.

Mr. Cornachio: I share Dr. Weiss' thoughts.

Dr. Gardyn: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to weigh in on what Mr. Cutolo has done. And we as an institution need to have, basically, sensors and sentries at certain positions that it will ensure our economic livelihood. It has been imperative, and it has been, basically, a God-send to have lobbyists like Dan Fisher up in the state level, who has been ensuring that the college gets its fair share of state funds. It is also imperative that we have someone in the county legislature who is involved with the intricacies of how to get things done. I'll give you the recent case in point. The fact that we have these retirements, we had expected and budgeted about 50 retirements. And at the time we did it, our answer was to be able to bond this so that we would be able to streamline that cost and put it out over ten years. We got into a position where NIFA just happened to draw a line in the sand against the county and say, "You can no longer bond your terminations using termination pay." We happened to get caught in the crossfire, and we as an institution have been very fiscally responsible. We have tried to do all the right things at the right time, and this was a solution to one of our problems. It was through Mr. Cutolo who was able to get in the door for us to meet with NIFA. And mind you, their answer right from the get-go was, "We are not letting you bond." It took a lot of lift for us to be able to get them to say, "Okay." And what we were able to get was two years, and you heard that at the finance report today. Now, we went from 50 to 106. So that blew that budget out from \$4 million to--what are we looking at--\$5 plus over each year. So that kind of intimate know-how with the legislature and how to get our budgets, one of the things that's going to be presented to make sure that the college has its fair shake is something that we need to have somebody who has a good, intimate set of knowledge about. If anybody recounts a history, Chuck before he was here, that was not the case. There are many of you who have been here for 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 years. Okay? It's a different set of circumstances today. Money does not flow like it did before. We have a battle at the state level to get our FTEs. We have a battle at the county level to get our budgets through. We are scrutinized each and every dollar that we try to put through. So this comes under the heading of, "We can't be pennywise and pound foolish." This is apposition that we have to evaluate, we have to look at, and find the right candidate for, because this is part of our economic livelihood. So always keep that in mind. And it has nothing to do that the value of that person is worth more than the value of the faculty. It's that we have to look at things that are going to come out for the economic good of the college.

Mr. Cornachio: In the meantime, what we will do is find somebody to go and fill that job who's already on staff.

Dr. Gardyn: We will evaluate what the qualifications are. As far as I know, there is no one who's been a United States Senator or has been the administrative aid in the Nassau County legislature for years. When you find me someone with that kind of experience, you talk to me. All right. Any other discussion? Anything else? All right.

### Speakers

Evelyn Wortsman Deluty, Chair of Academic Senate, remarks as presented:

I'm going to be speaking about three different issues. What would you do if you were faced with two contradictory facts? Chances are, you would investigate the evidence to see which version is a true representation of the real situation. Consider the following contradictory claims related to our Middle States accreditation. The 2004 Middle States report about Nassau Community College opens with this statement, "The institution has done a magnificent job of establishing a very strong, collegial decision-making environment to make use of the Academic Senate, which has enabled faculty, administration, and students to become mutually engaged in issues affecting the college." It continues by praising the "fair

and equitable manner" in which NCC conducts the operation of the college and specifies that "This effort is demonstrated through union agreements, academic senate bylaws, and many other publications, both internal and external." That's 2004, not the self-study but the Middle States' review, their report about us. The 2015 Middle States self-study that has just been submitted to Middle States makes the following statement about the same Academic Senate bylaws, bylaws that have not changed. And I quote, "A shared governance challenge arises from the language of the Senate bylaws." I ask you, how can those same Senate bylaws, which have not changed, facilitate effective governance in 2004 and obstruct it in 2015? The problem cannot be with the Senate bylaws. Yesterday, we met with Dr. General, the Middle States team leader. He assured us that, when Middle States visits the campus in March, they'll be looking at "truthfulness, accuracy, and validity" of the self-study. Those are his words. In the context of the Middle State standards, the contradistinction regarding the portrayal of the Senate bylaws and the implications that exist when one compares the 2004 Middle States report to NCC's 2015 Middle States self-study raises serious questions for standard four leadership and governance. I'm going to move on to a related issue that shows that there's certain misrepresentations of the Academic Senate. It was enlightening to witness the parliamentary procedure that unfolded in your proceedings here. We follow parliamentary procedure too at the Senate. The Board resolution of June 10<sup>th</sup> and I'm talking now about the multiple measures resolution, and I know the decision has been made already, but there's certain issues you should know about. The Board resolution of June 10<sup>th</sup> directed, and I quote from the resolution, "The Academic Senate and the administration to reconcile their respective differences and to reach a consensus." It's unfortunate that the members of the administration did not fully exercise or avail themselves of parliamentary procedure at the Senate meeting of October 27<sup>th</sup> when this was decided. It was a very positive step forward at this meeting to see that all constituencies at the Senate spoke and participated--faculty, students, and the administration--and that's a new move, and that was really good to see. However, the administration senators did not make the motion to amend the resolution and separate the math component from reading and writing scores. Such a move may have led to consensus. We don't know. But in the very least, we do know that that's what parliamentary procedure allows one to do, and that's what is expected of a Senator to reach consensus. I'd like to move on to another issue to inform you of the happenings at the College. The third issue that I'd like to bring to your attention deals with the problems that have arisen as a result of last year's degree revisions of many of the discreet programs. That is computer science, criminal justice, not the liberal arts AA and AS degrees. In particular, I am referring to the revisions made to bring these discreet degrees into compliance with the SUNY Seamless Transfer Mandate and the key question is this: "Is SUNY Seamless Transfer a recommendation or a requirement?" Unfortunately, the manner in which last year's revisions of the discreet degrees was implemented has created a double standard. Discreet degrees, like criminal justice and computer science, follow SUNY Mandate requirements. The liberal arts, AA and AS degrees, only treat the mandate as a recommendation, not as a requirement. The advisement pattern submitted to bring the discreet degrees into compliance with SUNY Seamless Transfer were implemented as banner requirements. Banner is our computer system that matches the credits to the degree requirements and the degree. In addition, the banner requirements follow the SUNY GEN ED categories, not the Nassau Community College GEN ED categories. They're not the same. And, in fact, they're substantially different, because quite a substantial number of Nassau courses that meet Nassau GEN ED requirements do not meet SUNY GEN ED requirements. This results in serious implications for retention. Suppose a student starts at the college in a AA liberal arts degree, as the majority of our students do. The degree evaluation generated by the banner computer system, the online system that applies the credits to degree requirements, uses the Nassau GEN ED requirements as a guide. If this student changes her major to a discreet degree, like criminal justice or computer science, as so many of our students will do, her credits will now be evaluated based on SUNY GEN ED requirements. When this student switches from the AA liberal arts degree to a computer science degree, banner will not count the Nassau GEN ED courses and only recognize the SUNY GEN ED courses. What does that mean? Suppose a student has taken four courses, an art class, a communications class, and

two history classes. For Nassau GEN ED, the student has satisfied two humanities requirements and two social science requirements. For SUNY GEN ED, the same student has only satisfied one social science requirement. She's lost nine credits. So this student could have fulfilled all the requirements for the degree, and banner is going to still say, "You can't get your degree at Nassau Community College. You got to take nine more credits." This is a serious retention problem. Before any further revisions of any Nassau degrees are completed, I urge you to make sure that these and other problems resulting from last year's revisions are investigated and addressed. Our students deserve nothing less. Thank you.

Dr. Weiss asked Dr. Dolan to look into the points Dr. Deluty spoke about regarding Nassau GEN ED vs. SUNY GEN ED and report back to the Board.

Dr. Dolan commented that this is a topic that has already be agreed upon deserves a discussion, an investigation, not a closure, and I'm confident that within a short period of time, we'll be able to do it together.

Dr. Rosa, Academic Senate 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair remarks as presented:

I want to address the retirements briefly and that three months ago my department chair said, "We're going to have almost 100 retirements at this place." He knew. And I think part of the reason he knew is because he's got his ear to the ground and knows how the faculty are feeling at this institution at this point and part of the way the faculty are feeling at this institution is symbolized by the seating arrangement back there at the table in that seated around the table are obviously the trustees. There are three deans seated there and Dr. Dolan, all representatives of the administration. The administration has you ear, members of the Board of Trustees. The faculty feel disenfranchised. They're not listened to or maybe they're listened for our three minutes, but if you're wondering, obviously, there are many reasons for people retiring, but the faculty are feeling disenfranchised at this moment. I want to address the multiple measures. It's going to be very brief, because you addressed it over there. The academic setting is the language explaining the veto in President Dolan's letter with grave concern. The veto represents a repudiation of the shared governance process that has served Nassau so well for so much of our history. Furthermore, its wording tends to take away the faculty's responsibilities and powers over the ability to recommend requirements for admission. Language found both in the Senate bylaws and the NCCFT contract. And the set of bylaws and the NCCFT contract were both agreed to by Nassau Community College Board of Trustees. We are particularly upset that Interim President Dolan's letter described in his reasoning for the veto demonstrates that this action is not simply designed to make a minor change to the region score for the math placement exemption, but it's designed to assert that any Senate approved policy can be abrogated by the administration when they don't agree with it. This violates the spirit and attempts to negate the history of Nassau's successful shared governance processes and the academic senate calls on the Board of Trustees to recognize that spirit and to validate the language in its decisions and guidance to the institution. Thank you.

Trustee Cornachio commented:

I just think it's very unfair to say that we just listen to the administration and not the teachers. That's not true at all. But that does not mean that we're going to accept card blanche what the teacher units and what the Academic Senate says. We look. We scrutinize. We weigh. We balance. And we make a decision. And every decision made by this Board regarding the subjects you talk about, were honest decisions made after really serious deliberation, not only on one day, over months since I think this started in November. I just want to note that. You don't have to accept it. You don't have to believe it. But I have felt a need to answer. We spent many evenings over here talking to teachers. And you know what? That's a good thing. And they listened, and they weighed it, and they deliberated. And then, they made a decision. But because a guy goes against you, it does not mean that he randomly said, "Screw you people. I'm not



interested in what you think." That's not true.

David Stern, Academic Senate 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair remarks as presented:

I just wanted to mention the culinary program, because you mentioned the purchase. The Senate Curriculum Committee is working hard, and approving that program as part of process. I hope you're going to approve that process as it goes through. If you noticed, I declined to speak the last couple of Board meetings. I'm speaking tonight, because I realize, in spite of recent events, I still have hope in all of you, our trustees. I believe we share a mutual interest in our mission. And you, our BOT, want us to work together to succeed in that vision. It's evident in the way you crafted the June resolutions. It was said with pride at the meeting earlier, at the Academic Affairs meeting, that you wanted us to collaborate. Now, before many of you were on the board and prior to the Astrab assembled administration, there was a mutual respect between all the Middle States governing entities. That's the BOT, the administration, and the Senate. College policy, especially in the academic area, was developed so collaboratively that it didn't even require a discussion at the BOT. The BOT trusted this system enough that they did not see a need to interfere. Every modern academic aspect of this College was created this way. In fact, Nassau Community College's reputation, which you have a responsibility to maintain and improve, has resulted in over \$15 million in chargebacks. I know that budget is an issue. \$15 million in chargebacks because of our reputation, and has put Nassau Community College as the leading community college in producing transfer-ready students, as noted by our transfer colleges. Just ask any of them. They hold Nassau above Suffolk, Westchester, any of these other colleges you want us to lower our standards to. And it's been built on a foundation of collaboration. Then came the Astrab/Saunders administration team. This team is on a mission to replace meaningful collaboration with a pattern of administrative dictates, which lead to Senate veto overrides or direct BOT action, as we saw tonight. This administrative team is more focused on who has power than what's best to meet our mission. The Senate's power is not its veto override. It's the ability to be informed for true collaboration. We need to trust our trustees even more than ever to put us back on track. The Middle States self-study is reflective of this misguided undertaking by the administration. The chapter and standard four on governance describes the Senate and the BOT in a very unflattering manner. I hope you read it, all of your board members. Yet, the administration is held in high regard. The recommendations of that report says that both the BOT and the Senate need to do self-assessment. The administration, no self-assessment. The recommendations included again self-assessment for both the BOT and the Senate, but no assessment for the administration. Instead, it recommends a pay raise. I strongly encourage that you all read that study. This refusal to collaborate by the administration has diminished our ability to improve recruitment and retention. Why has this administration been only focused on diminishing Senate participation in decision-making? Over the past year or so, we have spent an inordinate amount of time on only a few issues, like overloading classes and lowering academic standards, and we should be collaborating on improving recruitment and retention. Several of the departments, including the one I'm in, have initiated studies to bring in students from Binghamton when they have deferred admission or to get high school students to take college credits here. Those are faculty initiatives, not this administration. Earlier, you praised at the academic affairs meeting the English 100 course. And it should be praised. It's a very successful program. Guess what? That came from the same Senate committee that you rejected in your resolution later. That committee initiated the English 100 and made it a process, and it's been extremely successful. We all know why students are leaving. It's not because NCC is too restrictive. It's because they have financial and personal reasons. That's been done through study after study, even beyond Nassau Community College. If we want to improve retention, we need to collaborate--again, collaborate--to improve the economic opportunities for our students and provide more professional advisement. During the 10/27 Senate, our last Senate meeting, both sides, the Senate Development Ed Committee, which are made up of administrators, faculty, and students, and the dissenting members of that committee, which are just the administrators,

presented their case to the full Senate. In spite of the fact that the dissenting administrators dominated the discussion they spent a lot more time than anyone else in the discussion, the evidence presented by the committee convinced the senate to vote in favor of its proposal. This is because the committee's resolution contained more multiple measures, which you disregarded in the Academic Affairs meeting, and data to support retention. As you know, the interim president has vetoed this resolution, unfortunately. So here we are today, hoping our BOT will be fair and objective. The administration no longer sees a need to collaborate in the Senate. Right now, they believe they do not need to collaborate, because the BOT will enact anything they proposed. In fact, it was stated as such in the last Senate meeting when an administrator informed the Senate, "If you don't do what the administration proposes, then the BOT will do it for them." I'm speaking tonight, because I reject pronouncement. I do believe this BOT is still independent and will not automatically approve anything any administration gives them. I ask that the board--I just want to say I hope you promote collaboration, not reject it.

Prof. Chris Merlo, Academic Senate Secretary, remarks as presented:

Good evening, Board members. Before I begin, I asked someone to donate three minutes, and I'm not going to pronounce her last name. I'm going to start with a question for all of you. I mean absolutely no disrespect, because I think you're all going to get it right. Can you tell me how much that is? It says one plus negative three. I assume that all of you-- I know that pretty much everybody in this room can answer that question. And there is a reason that I bring it up. This sort of question shows up as part of other questions in courses across the curriculum, from statistics to biology to economics to computer science to medicine. It represents the kind of skill that a person who is prepared for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century's economy can handle without breaking a sweat. It's also the sort of question that students in remedial math courses here at Nassau are often at a complete loss to answer. It's not that they don't know the answer. Sometimes, they don't even know how to start to answer the question. They don't know where to begin. Sometimes, they don't know how to read the question. Now, there's a bunch of us in this room I think I counted seven or eight the last time I looked around--who have taught remedial math before. Ask all of us whether we've seen a student struggle to answer a question like this. And every single person in this room who's taught 001 or 002 in math will have a story to tell you. Some of these stories involve the immediate digging in a school bag for a calculator for one plus negative two. Some stories involve the random guessing of answers. Is it two? Is it four? It's negative four, right? Is it three? I'm telling you these stories are here as factors. Some stories involve blank stares, deliberate in silence, mouth open, hoping to God that somebody will answer the question first. Some of these stories involve fear and hopelessness and tears. The stories you hear of students that can't answer this question are not the stories of isolated, random incidents. This happens every semester to hundreds of students. Is this a college level math skill?

Is a student who can't figure this out ready for college level math? If the students in this math class or astronomy class or a business class can't do this, chances are they can't even understand the wording of questions they're exposed to. Such students will feel out of place in these credit level courses. They may be humiliated. They won't pass. This is the antithesis of a retention plan. Placing such students into credit level courses will only result in students leaving the college. Furthermore, any time one of us devotes to re-explaining or auditing prerequisite information slows down the rest of the class, and we run the risk of not retaining the students who do belong in these higher level classes. We faculty are fortunate that most of us don't have to think about budgets or teaching lines or enrollment figures. Certainly, every academic department has a committee all personnel invited where these are the issues of the day. But for most of us, we get to spend our time teaching students about something we love, and then learn more about it so that we can teach it even more effectively. This college gives us the opportunity to become experts in our fields, so that we not only understand the material at a deep level, but we also understand which students will benefit from learning this material and which ones won't. I mention this because the administration of this College has chosen to paint this disagreement over placement testing exemption

numbers as us versus them. Faculty versus administration. And I think that such categorization distracts us from the real issue. I think the real issue is not us versus them but academics versus budget. The faculty who sit on the Developmental Education Committee are there because they are the experts in what material must be re-taught to which students so that we maximize the amount of students who are properly placed in classes and therefore maximize the amount of students that this college potentially retains and graduates, and that's it. The majority statement from the Developmental Committee is grounded in academics, and the minority statement is not. We are an academic institution, not a factory. Success must not be measured by how many students are placed into credit level classes, but how many students with such placement can succeed in those classes? It doesn't matter how much money we save if the students can't pass and won't return. The college has hired experts. Their ID cards say faculty on them. Listen to your experts. Do what's right for the students. Do what's right for the people of Nassau County. Thank you.

The following discussion took place:

Dr. Gardyn: Chris, "That equation that you have there, do you think a student who scores 80 on the regents or 500 on the SAT or 21 on the ACT could answer that question?"

Prof. Merlo, "With respect, Dr. Gardyn, I don't know. This is not my area of expertise. I am mostly-- Listen, you asked me an honest question. With respect, I'm giving you an honest answer, because I don't know what the questions on the test are.

Trustee Drucker: You're quick to summarize other answers that may not be in your purview, whether you know it or not.

Dr. Gardyn: Chris, I didn't want to pick you apart. What I was asking was, between what the standard was before and the standard is now, which is a slight decrease, I don't think that affects your remedial student. Your remedial person is not going to achieve these scores. I think your remedial person is in need of the courses that are being taught here. That is a discussion that I think really has to do with failure of the K-12 system in educating people to come up to our level to come in for college level math. I think that's a discussion that's outside of here. I think what we're trying to do is adjust the standard here just to make it a little bit more equitable. I think that our bar was set just a tad high. I think it's been adjusted down into a fair range. And I was just saying that the equation that you have there, I can absolutely agree that you're going to have people with that deer in the headlights look. But when you look at what we've set as a standard, and it's now multiple measures, one of each of these three, I think that they won't be in remedial classes. I think they'll be able to do great on whatever entry-level mathematics that is credit bearing. And remember, that was one of the other issues. We didn't want people wasting their time in remedial, non-credit-bearing courses to waste up their financial aid, because as you said and it was pointed out by several people here, finance has a lot to do with retention.

Prof. Merlo: First, most recently, you were talking about students wasting financial aid money in remedial courses. When those students need the remedial courses and are not placed into them and wind up in a higher level course, say Math 102, which is stat, or Math 109, which is algebra and trig, when that student gets placed into that high level class, they're not going to pass, and that's a real waste of their financial aid money, because now they signed up for this class that they're not learning anything from.

Dr. Gardyn: We did give them a bar. It's not that we lowered it to the floor, so they should be able to handle it. If they can do this--all we're saying is, if they can achieve these multiple measures, they should be able to handle those entry levels.

Prof. Merlo: To be fair--please don't take offense to this--you are not an expert.

Dr. Gardyn: No, I do not claim to be.

Prof. Merlo: And by the way, nor am I. I am not equipped to answer these questions. I'm a computer science guy. That's--

Dr. Gardyn: But, Chris, that's why in June we sent it back. Remember, we sent it back. It was done in reading. It was done in writing.

Prof. Merlo: No, no, no, no. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that you're misremembering what happened in June. Dr. Weiss, if I remember correctly, you thought that our math numbers were pretty much there, that the administrators and the Development Committee had come to agreement on math and reading and that it was the writing portion that you guys sent it back to us for.

Dr. Gardyn: Thank goodness we keep minutes, everything was sent back.

Prof. Merlo: Eventually, everything was sent back, but right before, if you look at the minutes, if you look at the transcript, that I think Anne typed out--and holy cow, what a job, I don't want that job. If you look at what Dr. Weiss said, right before the resolution that you guys voted on, I believe, Dr. Weiss--correct me if I'm misrepresenting your ideas or your words. I think what you said was that you had noticed a real agreement in the numbers in math and in reading. And, in fact, if you did decide to send this back, it would be for the writing--

Trustee Cornachio: It was Dr. Gardyn who said--

Prof. Merlo: Was it Dr. Gardyn? Okay. I read that a while ago. I was thinking--I'm sorry.

Trustee Weiss: Because when I saw 85 for regents, I said there's no way.

Dr. Gardyn: split it - There's 450. Do 500. Do 520.

Trustee Cornachio: Right, right.

Prof. Merlo: --therefore, and we've had this conversation before. But we didn't do--no one said anything to us until at least the semester started and probably halfway into September about fixing the math and fixing the reading, because we thought--

Dr. Gardyn: Chris, no, that is not true.

Dr. Weiss: Definitely not true.

Dr. Gardyn: Everybody was told very clearly we are not acting on the veto that acting President Saunders had done for the simple reason that we were sending it back to you guys to do, to go back and work on. The fact that the summer hit and you guys didn't do it until September that's - - , and we understood. That's why we said we'll leave it until November. But that was purposeful. In fact, today at the Academic Affairs meeting, I don't think you were here. David knows. I was elated to know that the sections that had worked on reading and worked on writing had come to consensus. That's what I want. No, you are absolutely correct. I am not the expert on education. Dr. Weiss probably is a lot better. Dr. Tuman who is not here. The rest of us are here to fill in. That's why we leave it you. We do consider you the experts on faculty. What I want you to be is the experts on consensus.

Prof. Merlo: To be fair, you have not left it to us with the math scores.

Dr. Gardyn: Well, let me tell you what. Chris, we'll take this offline afterwards. You can keep going with the--

Prof. Merlo: Okay. Can I respond to one of the things? 30 seconds. 30 seconds.

Dr. Gardyn: Absolutely, go ahead.

Prof. Merlo: You were talking about whether students who are either placed into remediation or not belong in the high level classes they belong in. I forget exactly what you said.

Dr. Gardyn: What I said is; if they are able to pass the standard, they don't need to be remediated.

Prof. Merlo: Okay. But if we keep changing the standard, then what they're passing--

Dr. Gardyn: This is the first time that we changed. This is the first time.

Prof. Merlo: This is not the first time. It's really not. And again, I know Professor DeSanto can speak more about this. Professor Alfar, I don't think he's here. The standards have moved a number of times. I don't know how many. I've never—

Dr. Gardyn: I've heard. It was higher years ago.

Prof. Merlo: Okay. That's what I'm saying. But I have taught Math 001. I have taught Math 002. I have taught Math 109.

Dr. Gardyn: Chris, I'm going to ask you to take time out, and we'll do this later.

Prof. Merlo: All I want to say is I've seen the look on the faces in all three of those classes when they don't get what's happening, and it's horrifying that we do that to the kids.

Dr. Gardyn: All right.

Trustee Weiss: And I need to just correct for the record there was no way that I had agreed, because I was the one who spoke against the 85 on the regents very vociferously. So I just want to go on the record that it wasn't me.

Prof. Merlo: Noted, and my apologies.

Trustee Cornachio: I thought the only disagreement was on math. And then, Dr. Dolan said, "No, no, no, no."

Trustee Weiss: Dr. Dolan wasn't here.

Trustee Cornachio: the minutes are on the website. And just one comment. I think you're forgetting we have open enrollment. And unfortunately, there are people here who have dreams. They have no business being here, and they will never succeed here if you give them 3,500 remedial courses. They belong in a different place. And that's a reality we can't ignore.

Prof. Jason Gorman, Professor of Art, remarks as presented:

Good evening, Dr. Dolan and Board of Trustees. I hope you indulge me in a little bit of a preamble so that my next words can be understood in the spirit that they're intended. I believe that each one of you were chosen for your positions because you're honorable, intelligent, hardworking people. And I believe that all of you believe that you're doing the right thing. I believe that you think it's good, and you're doing the right thing for this college and its students. I believe that you're interested in transparency, and I see evidence of that. But I just wanted to submit, and I think it's important, to also give the appearance of transparency. And when I say that, I believe that some of the actions, and not necessarily by all the members of this board or the previous board, but from time-to-time could be misconstrued by the public as being more, not upholding transparency as a principal that's to be embraced, but rather as a restriction to be circumvented. So I wanted to make a few suggestions that I think would help. Four to be exact. One of the suggestions that I'd like to make, and other Boards of Trustees do this, is to not only record the audio of your sessions, your meetings, but also record the video and post them yourselves. Lots of boards do that. I think that it would be a tremendous step forward with showing that you would like to be transparent. I do believe you do want that. Another suggestion that I'd like to make, and I do recognize that some—it's been a little bit better just very lately but there have been times when the minutes and the calendars have gone very, very late. So I would like to suggest that you just renew your commitment to putting up those calendars and minutes early, because the purpose of them is so that we can see what you're going to talk about. A third thing that I would like to suggest is that it's really tough for us when

something is not on the calendar is discussed and then voted on here. And we've seen it commonly. The multiple measures wasn't on the calendar, right? Well, we don't get a chance to speak until after you voted. So seeing as we have a time limit anyway, I'd like to suggest that you allow the public to speak before you take your votes, before your meeting, just reverse the order. So those are my four suggestions. I'd also like to discuss a few things about what was previously said. One of the things that brought up a lot of confusion to night was the Seamless Transfer Resolution that you voted on. I would like to submit this simple reason is why. When you voted on that resolution, the focus was merely on 64 credits. I would like to just remind you all that you voted on ten parts of the SUNY Seamless Transfer, and the other nine parts are what is wreaking havoc at the college now. Being an advisor, I know this. I do believe that SUNY feels that the other nine—I think that it would be a very simple thing to fix that problem. Just amend your resolution to clarify that what you were proposing was the 64-credit limit and not nine things in the SUNY Seamless Transfer, because while SUNY says they're for SUNY students, I can assure you they're not necessarily good for all students, especially those who aren't planning on transferring to a SUNY school. One of the last things that I want to propose—this is a suggestion towards transparency, and I'm bringing it up last, because I'd like to actually pose the question to you. I noticed that on tonight's calendar, one of the items that you entered into executive session was written in such a way that I could not decipher it. It was the Item Number 4, where it was basically personal matters, and it was a long list of things that you could go into executive session for. Just to jot a couple of things down, "Matters leading to the proposal"—I'm sorry, "Of reviewing medical, financial, or employment history in particular," that's very vague. The reason why you announce the executive session in the public is, of course, so the public can determine if it's appropriate to go to the executive session. So I wanted to ask you, what was the particular reason for that item that you entered into executive? In other words, there's no problem with mentioning who is the person and roughly what it's about. We're not asking for details, but we'd like to know that it was something specific. So may I pose that question to you now? What was the reason for going to executive session item number 4 that was on the calendar, personal matters?

The following discussion took place:

Dr. Dolan: We cannot reveal that, because it does involve a person. It does involve a private matter. And, in fact, were I to reveal it, that person could—have recourse.

Prof. Gorman: Well, what is medical? Because that question is all open that it might be medical.

Dr. Dolan: The language, and just so you know, Jason, is not vague. It's specific. It comes from the statute and those are the reasons we're allowed to go into executive session.

Prof. Gorman: Right. But those are the categories of reasons. You are expected to give the specific reasons that conformed to those - - . At least, that's my opinion, but I--

Dr. Dolan: I don't think we are, because, again, I need to protect the person that we were speaking about.

Prof. Gorman: I would like to just remind you of the four things. And I think it's very appropriate, since you are in session now, that if anybody feels it upon their heart to make a motion to do any of the things that I'm suggestion, go ahead. I'd be happy to hear it.

Dr. Dolan: Could I repeat them back to you? Post meetings. That is, put them online, video online. Get calendars up early and/or on time. Allow public to speak--

Prof. Gorman: Calendar and minutes.

Trustee Cornachio: And maybe also committee, because the--

Dr. Dolan: Wait, wait, wait. Don't give him any more suggestions.

Prof. Gorman: I had seven. I already eliminated three that I thought you would object to.

Dr. Dolan: Allow public to speak before votes and?

Prof. Gorman: And the third one was, for your executive sessions, just be more specific as to the reasons instead of giving vague--

Dr. Dolan: I have four.

Dr. Weiss: I certainly think, as a board member, it's worthy of discussing all of them at some time, maybe not at this hour. But I will comment that I think that Anne Brandi does an incredible job of trying to get everything done. And if anything, I think we force her to get the calendar out almost too soon, so that we're always getting revisions on the calendar. So I do believe that if we're meeting on a Tuesday night- that if the calendar's published on a Thursday, that's sufficient time for people to know what's on the agenda. The committees are listed on that calendar when we're meeting. Unfortunately, the times are not accurate, but--

Trustee Cornachio: Committee agendas aren't, though, are they?

Dr. Weiss: No

Prof. Gorman: But there's been times where they haven't been posted and the minutes haven't been posted until--

Dr. Weiss: But I'm just saying, in fairness, just know that it's a very difficult thing to get it all done. And I think we all want better time--

Dr. Weiss: We can check into it. But Dr. Dolan, I hate to add another thing to your list, but again, this is like Dr. Deluty. We're hearing about the Seamless Transfer Resolution that we passed a long time ago and I would love for somebody, not tonight, to teach me about the nine things that we're hearing about versus the ten, because I don't remember it being delineated to us as a board like that.

Trustee Cornachio: No, because they were boycotting the issue, even though they say they weren't. They weren't giving us input. They were just against it, period. Subsequently, I also heard, "Do you know that 70% of the courses can be online and taught at any institution, not just"--"Actually, no, I didn't know that." "Did you know that"--I said, "Hey, you should have said something then."

Dr. Weiss: But if there's more information for us to have as a board--and again, I don't expect all of this right away, because we--

Dr. Dolan: We won't have it this week, right.

Dr. Weiss: But I think that I need to understand what you're talking about. I don't want it now, because my brain is addled at this point.

Prof. Gorman: I won't do that. But is my understanding correct that the board basically voted on the 64 credits? Is that what your understanding was?

Trustee Cornachio: We thought we were voting for the 64 credits, because that's what--

Dr. Weiss: Mandated by SUNY.

Trustee Cornachio: Yes, the Seamless Transfer, it sounded good.

Dr. Weiss: Yes.

Prof. Gorman: And you were unaware of the nine other points, because it's transfer--

Trustee Cornachio: And your colleagues at the institution--there were different colleagues--that took a stand that they were all against it, were against it all.

Dr. Weiss: I want to be careful not to have words put in my mouth. I don't know that I didn't know about the nine things. This was a while ago.

Prof. Gorman: I hope it's clarified.

Stuart Kaplan, Prof. of Mathematics, remarks as presented:

And it was 64 credits. I'm not a developmental education expert, but I have taught the remedial math courses in the past. I'm here as an educator, but most importantly, a concerned parent of a 15-year-old and 11-year-old. The decisions this body makes may one day affect my children. As I listen to the conversations here at the college and attending most of the Board of Ed meetings for my school district, I try to comprehend what direction education is going. We are discussing lowering the SAT cutoff scores for incoming students, college students, so they will not need to take a placement exam, actually a competency exam, in math equivalent 3rd Grade to 8th Grade. At the September meeting, Meet Your Teacher Night, at my daughter's classroom in 6th Grade, on the black board there--I took a picture of it--the teacher informed us of the classes and schedule my child will have. I saw this on the classroom board, exercises evaluating algebraic expressions. My daughter, all of 11 years old, with some kids still 10 depending upon their birthdays, has classwork that we teach in our Math Remedial 002 class. We can expect the 10 and 11-year-olds to do this, but not the incoming college freshmen? My son now in 10<sup>th</sup> Grade took the Regents exam in integrated algebra in June of 2014. It seems the raw score to scaled score conversion chart on the State Ed website shows that a student taking this exam can get 30 out of 87 raw score points, and it converts to a 65 on their transcript. 30 out of 87 is not a 65. He could have skipped the short answer Part 2 and Part 3 of the exam and did 15 out of 30 multiple choice questions correct at two points each and achieved a passing score of 85. Last year, he took the geometry regents, where a raw score of 40 out of 86 is scaled to a 65. Many of these students didn't pass. They got passed. Sooner or later, it's going to catch up to them. It has caught up to them. Dr. Weiss was correct in her earlier meeting where she said the SAT and PSAT is changing. On 10/14/2015, my son took the Common Core PSAT, not the one offered in previous years. In my district, my son, when he was in 8<sup>th</sup> Grade, 9<sup>th</sup> Grade, and 10<sup>th</sup> Grade, he takes both the Common Core and the regular Regents in mathematics. They used the higher of the two grades to put on his transcript, because they're not the same. When students go into courses they are not prepared for with the necessary skills, they will suffer for it, and it could be multiple times. As a parent, I hope that my children are prepared to take and pass their courses with the required knowledge and skills that we as a family are so invested in. Thank you.

Ms. Dawn Smith, Student Personnel Services, remarks as presented:

Good evening. I'm Dawn Smith, and I feel like I'm going to beat a dead horse, but I want to speak about Dev Ed. Before I do that I want to thank Chuck as the former chair of the NCCFT PAC Committee. I appreciate everything he does with the legislature, and I just want to let you know that we do have a committee that sees the legislature. We endorse the legislator. We walk with the legislators. And we belong to NYSUT, and NYSUT has a whole crew of people that lobby on the state level for community colleges and Nassau specifically, and we also go up to Albany to do that. So he works hard, but he had help with the faculty. So I just wanted to start with that and thank him for his service. I work in the Center for Students with Disabilities, and I do administer the placement test, and I read this placement test to students. So I'm really very familiar with what it contains. And it is grade school and junior high work, and we're asking the students to be able to do that to be in a college level class. The multiple measures for exemptions is just that, an exemption. We're not placing these students in remediation. We're not saying, "You know what? Your scores weren't good enough. We're putting you in a remediation class." We're saying, "We need a little more information to properly evaluate your skills." And if they have not reached the cutoffs that the college has decided to exempt them, then they take the placement test. And if they have the skills, they'll be placed in a college bearing class. If they don't have the skills, they need to be placed in a remedial class. I am also a member of the Dev Ed Committee, and I was on the Math Subcommittee and I can assure you we had many, many, many meetings, and we analyzed the data and in our subcommittee, we came up with an agreement of what we would bring to the Dev Ed Committee, and



it was faculty, administrator, students, who agreed, and we brought it back to the Dev Ed Committee. It was voted on. 15 voted yes, 2 no. And then, it was brought to the senate where it was also voted on and passed. And then, it went to Dr. Dolan, who vetoed it and I'm quite upset at that. Why?

The following discussion took place:

Trustee Cornachio: Because you felt it did not follow the sense of the Board and the sense of the administration just prior to his that looked at his carefully and made certain conclusions about what substance was passed. And he did the right thing, frankly.

Ms. Smith: Well, I respect your opinion.

Trustee Cornachio: And this is not meant personally. We think it was the right thing to do.

Ms. Smith: Well, I respectfully disagree, and I also respectfully disagree with how it's done. Before we received that veto, an alternate resolution was already on the agenda for tonight, and I think that's disrespectful. If it's already there and it hasn't even been vetoed, that disrespects our whole process, our governance process.

Trustee Cornachio: It was not disrespectful.

Ms. Smith: I'm just saying how it feels.

Trustee Cornachio: Anyone that read the transcripts of those proceedings on June 9<sup>th</sup> I think it was, it was clear what this board was looking for and what the Saunders' administration was looking for and what you came up with- it's far removed from that. How could anybody, unless they were asleep at those meetings and the six months of meetings before that--they'd have to be asleep not to realize that was going to be the reaction.

Ms. Smith: Well, if you look at the compromises that were made. I don't agree. Well, again, I believe that the Dev Ed resolution, which was one resolution, not three, was more data-driven, and it was definitely more appropriate.

Debra DeSanto, President of the NCCFT, remarks as presented:

Once again, I come before you to speak about the need to replace the full-time lines. This is not going to be a surprise to you. There are 105--my numbers are saying 106 tonight. That's fine. Faculty opted for their retirement incentive. But if you recall at last meeting, I discussed all the other lines that were not replaced since the start of the semester. By our account, the number is significant. Last week, at the Academic Affairs meeting, once again, we heard no money, as we're hearing again tonight. When Dr. Saunders was asked when chairs on the P and B would know how many lines were being replaced, they were told there were budgetary issues and that faculty can still change their minds about retiring, so these factors needed to be considered. Things weren't looking good financially. You can imagine the reactions to these statements. This incentive was well thought out at the table, and we were told somehow that the benchmark was 50 lines, and then the lines would be replaced. Yet, at recent meetings, we're hearing a different story. This was not a one-sided conversation, as I discussed at last month's meeting. We bargained in good faith on these lines that need to be replaced. Of course, there is going to be initially outlay of funds, but this was discussed at length during negotiations, and this is where I'm going off on my script here. I sat here, and I listened tonight about going to Nassau County and they didn't bond, and you thought you were going to be bonded for ten years, and we were lucky that we ended up getting two years, and I agree. Maybe we are lucky. But again, you can go back in. The bottom line here is, if you couldn't fund this retirement, then maybe your attorneys or whoever were representing the Board of Trustees and the other side should have capped this retirement incentive.

The following discussion took place:

Dr. Gardyn: Debbie, I'm going to stop you right there, because you're talking out of turn. And I'll tell you why. Because when we were negotiating, which was in 2014, that was the normal operation was to be able to bond termination pay. It changed. And if you were listening very carefully, we would have told you that the NIFA Board changed the line in the sand in August of this year. As good as we are at many things, we are really bad at predicting the future, so please do not follow that line of logic. When we sat down at the table and talked about who is retiring and what our plans were, it did not account for us to have to find a bond for two years.

Prof. DeSanto: Okay. So that was a factor, but there's other ways which you could have produced the money.

Dr. Gardyn: Oh, really?

Prof. DeSanto: Yes. And let me just finish, because you're interrupting me right now and I have--

Dr. Gardyn: But we had to stop an inaccuracy, because that's one of the things-- No, that is one of the things. I'm going to let you continue, but one of the things you have to be able to do is you can't paint a picture that is a lie.

Prof. DeSanto: Okay. Well, I don't think I'm painting a picture that is a lie.

Dr. Gardyn: No, no. It was a lie.

Prof. DeSanto: Let me just tell you there's other ways which you can fund us. And to say that, "Now, we didn't think that there was going to be 105. We didn't think there was going to be 106. We didn't think there was going to be 120," that's what's known as negotiations. And you're paying attorneys that could have very well capped this. If you didn't think that this was a possibility--and again, you gambled on the number, and we all did. We didn't know what the number would be, but the bottom line is you should have looked at it and figured out the line item and figured out how you're going to pay for it. There's other ways that this could be worked out. There's money there. Look at different types of contracts that are out there. And I'm going to continue to go on. We're probably not going to agree, but I'm not lying when I'm telling you what I believe to be the facts. You could have capped this if you didn't feel that 105 would be something that you could afford. Anyway, in essence, what we have right now, and this is the important part that I want to get to. We have departments that are being pitted against each other to justify why a department--this department lost six lines and you lost six lines. So tell me how we're going to figure out how we're going to get these lines? So these departments now are looking at criteria and whoever can make the best arguments, I suppose, and who also has the strongest area dean who may advocate for them is going to be able to perhaps get a line here or there, pitting people against each other. And these are not just my sentiments. This is the sentiments of the faculty. We have departments that have lost double digits, double digits, so this is huge here. When I raise the question about criteria number 6--I'm assuming you all saw the criteria at this point--regarding adjuncts and what number the administration feels is a cutoff, of courses being taught by adjuncts, I was told there is no number. Then why are you asking the question? We discussed last time the benefits of the students for the full-time faculty in place. Adjuncts play an important role on campus, and many adjuncts are waiting for years of service here to apply for a full-time position. With this particular group of retirees, we are losing two distinguished faculty and 17 chancellor award recipients, just to name a few of these accomplishments. Let's give the students the best that we have to offer by bringing in talented new full-time faculty to replace these dedicated faculty members who are moving on. So I ask you the Board, what will you do to maintain the reputation of this institution on behalf of our community and our students? We need these lines replaced, and I thank you.

Dr. Weiss: I hate to be the one that keeps asking questions, but she referred to criteria that she's assuming we know about. And unless I'm not reading everything, I don't know about any criteria. Debbie made an assumption that we know about something. Criteria for hiring?

Trustee Cornachio: Number 6.

Dr. Weiss: You said Criteria Number 6. I don't know of any criteria.

Trustee Cornachio: Oh, she's talking about Middle States?

Dr. Weiss: No, no, no. She's talking about hiring.

Dr. Dolan: Dr. Saunders can answer it. Yes, I know what criteria number 6 is. Thank you.

Dr. Saunders: I would just like to speak to that. At the last academic chairs meeting, what I did when I met with the chairs is I provided them with a list of criteria that the academic deans would be looking at and considering what lines would be replaced. We gave them a list of; I think it was about nine considerations. I also gave--eight considerations. I also gave to the chairs a timeline within which, if there were additional considerations that they would like the academic deans to utilize in making these decisions, then we would incorporate those. I then informed them that each of the chairs would have to submit a letter requesting the number of lines that they felt they needed with a justification for it. There would be a period where their respective area dean would be discussing those considerations based on the considerations that we had listed with them. And then, as an administration, we would establish a priority in terms of the lines that we think that we would be able to fill and then look at the available funding sources and see how many of those lines would be filled. We tried to create a process that was participatory and judicious, and that's what was being made reference to.

Trustee Cornachio: I have one question. Do you recall anything Dr. Saunders about a commitment that we would hire 50% of the teachers that were laid off, that the number of teacher replacements full-time would be 50% of those laid off? Because I don't.

Dr. Saunders: No, I'm unaware of that.

Trustee Cornachio: Because Debbie mentioned that at the last Board meeting, and no one knows what you're talking about.

Prof. DeSanto: Well, what I said, and if you listened to what I said today, there was a benchmark of a number of 50, that if you had 50 retirements--

Trustee Drucker: Who established that?

Prof. DeSanto: if they had left at that point, then what we would do is we would be replacing the lines, because you felt that you would be making a significant amount of money, because you're cutting back. If you go back in the notes, and I'm sure that you have the minutes from it also, there was a huge discussion during the negotiations. And I'm sure John Gross and his team has it. We talked about \$100,000 to \$50,000 and the amount of savings and the replacement of lines and we talked about the formulation of a committee to figure out how these lines would be replaced. And there was definitely conversation about--

Trustee Cornachio: I can't gain say any of that. I can tell you this much, though. It was never discussed at a Board meeting.

Prof. DeSanto: Yes, it was.

Trustee Cornachio: Well, not when I was there, and I think I've attended just about every meeting.

Trustee Drucker: And a conversation is different than a benchmark. Who established a benchmark? Where did that come from?

Prof. DeSanto: Well, that was coming from--at that time, it was your academic area that was talking about it. It was the area deans, and it was also you interim person.

Trustee Drucker: There was no benchmark. There might have been conversations. That's a big difference between benchmarks.

Trustee Cornachio: But that doesn't mean that we wouldn't like to replace full-timers, but we have to have the

money for it.

Prof. DeSanto: Okay. Well, I'm not saying that. What I'm saying to you is that there's other avenues which this money is there. There's other contracts that are out there that we talked about, the part-time ordinance contracts. There's other means by which you can get money to substitute and put these full-time faculty in. To decimate these departments, we have departments that are losing 10, 14, 6 out of 12 people, what are we doing here? And to sit here and argue and debate like this, we're trying to work together, but yet there's this attitude, as you alluded to and other people that are speaking here tonight, this is not how we should be having this discussion.

Dr. Gardyn: Excuse me. Hold on a second. One of the things that we have learned tonight is, and if you were there at the finance meeting, we just learned tonight what are some of the financial implications. That is all brand new information to the Board. Right now, we have turned to administration to do an analysis of what are the lines that are out and came up with a game plan. So we are in the process of evaluating, okay, what would be able to be done.

Prof. DeSanto: Okay. I understand. I'm the president of the union--

Dr. Gardyn: So the sky is not falling, but we have to analyze what's goes on.

Prof. DeSanto: when we go to the meetings and what we're hearing is that it doesn't look good and there may not be replacement of these lines, and its justification, which I get, because you have to make a decision one way or another, the bottom line is I tried to tell you the talent that we were losing. These lines have to be replaced, and this is my job. I represent what used to be said 700 full-time faculty members. I'm going to come up here, and I'm going to plead for these lines. This is what I was elected to do. So if you expect me to do anything other than that, then I'm not doing my job, and I'm going to continue to do that. I told you I would continue to do that.

Dr. Dolan: And if I could, Deb, I want to go back to some of the language you used, "Things aren't looking good. It's going to be hard." It sounds very much like me. And I absolutely-- But that doesn't mean that some of the items that you brought to my attention over the last two weeks, I haven't poured over. And between the lines, what you're saying is we need to look at other places to find out if there is money someplace else that can be used to help to replace lines. That is going on. That is going on. We're hampered by several things, but I'm not waving a white flag. I acknowledge that with 106 people leaving, we can't say none of these lines will be filled. We can't say that, and we have to find a way to replace as many lines as we can, and I don't know what that means.

Trustee Cornachio: But if you read the committee meeting, what we were told the amount of the losses would be is conditioned upon there being no--it was referred to as backfills. No hiring of new full-timers, and if we hired an adjunct, the laws would get graded by reason of the salaries paid to the adjuncts. So listen.

Prof. DeSanto: I pleaded the case. The decision is ultimately your decision to figure this out. I did the best that I can do right now.

Dr. Gardyn: Your warning is noted. But just so you know, we are doing our job to evaluate that. Okay? And try to make it public. That's why it was out there at the finance committee. We handed out the flyers. You saw what the numbers were, right? Okay.

Dr. Dolan: This conversation is not over.

Prof. DeSanto: I understand. I understand.

Stefan Krompiewski, President, Adjunct Faculty Association, remarks as presented:

The first thing that I want to say, and I want to say it for the record, the Adjunct Faculty Association believes and wants the Board, the administration, to work hard to maintain every single line, every single

full-time line that exists. But understanding the economic realities that we all have to deal with, we understand that some lines and most likely are going to be lost. Temporarily, we hope, because we're looking for you to restore those lines and seriously consider adjunct faculty when you're looking to hire full-time faculty in the future. Secondly, at the last meeting, there was some questions and comments about the adjunct faculty and who we are. They were very good questions, and we took them to heart. We administered the survey- 600 adjuncts responded. And we had a series of questions, and the questions helped answer who we are, questions like how many of us are pure adjuncts. How many of us are pure adjuncts who work in other colleges? How many of us are pure adjuncts who work in more than one college? How many of us are adjuncts and full-timers? How many of us are adjuncts and retired full-timers? Dr. Dolan, you can slow down your pen, because I'm going to send you a copy of the survey, the results and our comments. We met with the Student Government Association, because after the meeting last time we spoke they had an interest in finding out who we are. I shared the results of the survey with them, and we had a healthy discussion, with their advisors there to help the Student Government Association understand who we are. Lastly, we all need a laugh. We all need a big laugh. The Adjunct Faculty Association is going to be holding a comedy fundraiser on December 9<sup>th</sup> at Governor's Comedy Club in Levittown for the NEST. Governor's sits about 300 people. We haven't started selling tickets yet. We have a commitment for 125 tickets already. We invite everybody to come. You will be receiving an email from us or already did and the faculty in general will receive an email, and our adjuncts are going to be receiving an email, and you're going to understand how you can purchase tickets. The headliner will be a former Nassau Community College student, a graduate. We're hoping to have two other comics who are Nassau Community College graduates. It is a fellow teaching sitting here today who is a faculty member who just told me that he's a standup comic, and he'd like to do five minutes.

Kimberley Reiser, Prof. of Biology remarks as presented:

I would like to underscore what Professor DeSanto said about the need for full-time faculty replacements. Yesterday, an AAUP called on you our trustees to act and declare a moratorium on administrative raises until full-time faculty replacement lines are issued and tuition is stabilized. I assume, because there was no mention in public session that no raises were awarded tonight. The simple fact is that the face of Nassau Community College is changing to detriment of our students. The number of full-time faculty at NCC has declined sharply, while at the same time, the number of administrators has increased dramatically. Add to the mix the fact that administrators remuneration has increased, and we can't help but wonder, "What is next?" Five years ago, there were 752 full-time faculty. As of today, we're down to 660, and when we being spring semester, our numbers will stand at 585. This is an astounding 22% loss since 2010. We're told that the college is broke, yet now we have 74 full-time administrators. 17 of these were added in the last three years, along with ten part-time administrators. In 2014, the average administrator salary was \$107,401 with the majority of these employees serving less than nine years at NCC. It takes faculty about 15 years just to make it to \$100,000. To add insult to injury, over the past six years, we've seen many administrators receive anywhere from 10% to 40% increases, either as raises or as title changes. I hope that you are no longer contemplating giving these employees a 2.25% across the board increase, and I'm heartened by Trustee Weiss' comments about the necessity of evaluating the hiring of replacement administrators. Clearly, the new normal at NCC is that faculty do more and essentially earn less. And what about our students? They are short-changed, because their full-time faculty is shrinking. Their class sizes are increasing, and the College continues to cut the types of resources and services our students genuinely need to succeed. And what about that tuition bill? All indication is that our students will be saddled with another substantial increase for fall 2016. We thought providing a high-quality; low-cost liberal arts education was our institution's primary service. It's up to you to make it so.

Dr. Dolan: I'm not sure who may have said the college is broke. The college is not broke. The college cauldrons are not empty. We do have a reserve position. Yes, there are some challenges Deb. We have a heavy

lift ahead of us but we are certainly and I wouldn't want that to appear anywhere out there. We're certainly not broke. And if anybody said that to you, please share with me who that was so that I can correct them.

Lynn Mazzola, Chair Accounting/Business department and Chair of all academic chairs, remarks as presented:

The chairs have graves concerns relating to the replacement of or lack of replacement of full-time faculty for spring of 2016 and fall of 2016. The chairs were given a timeline for Spring 2016 top line replacement new hire process by Executive Vice President Saunders last Thursday as Dr. Saunders mentioned that I will give to Anne Brandi to disseminate that states--this is a quote--"Monday, November 23<sup>rd</sup> through Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, area deans will discuss requests with chairs. Week of January 4, 2016, area deans will notify chairs of replacements/new hire approvals for spring 2016." Why so late? Why are chairs being informed so late about replacements, if any, of full-time faculty? All letters had to be in on the close of business on November 2, 2015. Why so late? Classes for spring 2016 start January 19<sup>th</sup>. Adjunct contracts must be signed January 13<sup>th</sup> through the 15<sup>th</sup>. If full-time faculty are to be hired, the new faculty should have offer letters prior to getting notice and resigning from other employment. This will not happen on this timeline. Are new full-time faculty supposed to leave other employment on a phone call from Nassau Community College? Would you leave your employment on a phone call? I wouldn't. Why so late? If full-time faculty are not to be hired, there is not enough time for chairs to properly plan for the spring of 2016 semester if we only find out so late. We will need to find new qualified adjunct faculty at the last minute, decide what classes will have to be canceled when new qualified adjunct faculty can't be found or are no longer available due to the lateness of the administration's decisions. Why so late? Finding out so late is a disservice to our students. They are entitled to have a well-thought-out and timely decisions as to the course offerings and faculty in the classroom. This process is not well-thought-out and definitely is not timely. Why so late? When I asked Executive Vice President Saunders at the academic affairs meeting if the timeline could be moved up from the week of January 4<sup>th</sup> to the end of the fall 2015 semester, he stated, no, that could not happen, as we had to wait until after December 31<sup>st</sup> in case a full-time faculty member changed their mind and didn't want to leave. All the letters that I and the other chairs received from full-time faculty retiring under the incentives stated, and I quote, "The irrevocable election for the early retirement incentive, it is our understanding from Executive Vice President Saunders that approximately of the 100 of the 105 or 106 retiring full-time faculty took this incentive. In addition, there are approximately 25 to 30"--

The following discussion took place:

Dr. Dolan: I would like to speak briefly, and, Lynn, I'm going to go back and look at some of this other stuff. I read every one of the letters that I received on my watch and responded to all of them. And very few of them had the phrase irrevocable in it. I'm going to go back and look, because I discussed this with Deb. It is a concern that we have that if resignation is not irrevocable, a person--heaven help all of us--could change their mind if the market were to suddenly become problematic. We would be very hard-pressed to hire somebody on December 15<sup>th</sup> and then have to call them up and say, "The person who we thought was leaving is not leaving." Even if it was just a phone call, we wouldn't be able to honor the promise that we made, and we've been operating under the assumption that these are not irrevocable. And to be honest, every other retirement incentive I've ever seen requires that it be irrevocable, which is why I looked to that phrase so frequently in the letters and was disappointed to find it so infrequently.

Prof. Mazzola: information on that, the letters I personally received in my department--that was December and two for August- we were told by HR this is what we had to write in the letters.

Dr. Dolan: Go back and look.

Carmine DeSanto, Chair of Math, Computer Science, and Information Technology, remarks as presented:

I was going to read the statement that I had partially read at the subcommittee meeting before people were shaking their heads. So I don't want to bore you. I could leave it for the record. Would that be okay?

Now, you're probably going to ask me; why do I have the minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting of June 9, 2015, Page 52 on my iPad. I don't know, but I'd like to read some of these comments here. It says:

*Chair Gardyn: Math and reading, they're both at 540. In math, am I reading this correctly? It's 490 to 510?*

*Trustee Weiss: Depending on the test.*

*Chair Gardyn: Depending on tests only. And 500. They're spot on there. On both of—so two out of three, they're right there. The only one that's out of synch is English at 540 and 500. Guys, not for anything, why don't you just say 520 tonight and call it a night?*

Trustee Cornachio: That's how I remember it.

Dr. Gardyn: That's English. It got sent back, and you guys came up with a resolution. So that's fine. Okay.

Carmine DeSanto's submitted the following statement for the record:

At the Developmental Education Meeting when the final vote on the Math Sub-Committee's Policy on exempting students from the Accuplacer Mathematics Exam in Algebra and Arithmetic was taken every department representative and the student representative voted to support the Math Sub-Committee's recommendations. The only two dissenting votes were cast by the two administrative deans. I interpreted this overwhelming vote of approval to mean that All Academic representatives were making an academic decision that they believed was in the best interests of our students.

I would like to state the rationale for the Math Sub-Committee's recommendations.

(1) SAT EXEMPTION POLICY:

Data supplied by the Administration showed that only 59.4% of the students who scored a 510 on the Math portion of the SAT exam were successful in a credit bearing mathematics course. The committee recommended at least a MATH SAT score of 520 or higher to be exempt from both the Algebra and Arithmetic Placement exams. Only a 490 to 510 Math SAT score is needed to be exempt from the Arithmetic Placement exam.

(2) NY STATE REGENTS INTEGRATED ALGEBRA EXAM POLICY (not Common Core):

Using the conversion chart for the January 2015 Regents results, a student only needs to earn 30 points out of a total of 87 points to earn a passing grade of 65. This is equivalent to an understanding of only 34.5% of the material tested. To score an 80 on the Regents (the administration's recommendation), a student only needs to earn 51 points out of a total of 87 points. This is equivalent to an understanding of only 58.6% of the material tested. To score an 85 on the Regents (the sub-committee's recommendation), a student needs to earn 65 points out of a total of 87 points. This is equivalent to an understanding of 74.7% of the material tested. Taking these test results into consideration along with the fact that High School students take this Regents in either 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> grade, the committee was concerned that students who know barely 59% of the material on this exam (the administration's recommendation) would have a questionable math skill level when enrolling in a college credit math course three or four years later. Furthermore, representatives of the College Board, who developed the Accuplacer Math exam, have stated that the most influential factor in how a student performs on

the mathematics placement exam is the last time a student took a math course. Thus, the sub-committee recommended at least a score of 85 on the NY State Regents Integrated Algebra exam to be exempt from both the Algebra and Arithmetic Placement exams provided the exam was taken within the previous four years.

(3) NY STATE REGENTS ALGEBRA 2/TRIGONOMETRY EXAM POLICY (not Common Core):

Using the conversion chart for the January 2015 Regents, a NY State Regents Algebra 2/ Trigonometry exam score of at least 80 will exempt incoming students from both the Algebra and Arithmetic Placement exams provided the exam was taken within the previous four years. To score an 80 on this Regents (the sub-committee's recommendation), a student needs to earn 62 points out of a total of 88 points. This is equivalent to an understanding of 70.5% of the material tested. The Administration's proposal did not include this exemption option but the Math Sub-Committee wanted to include additional measures for exemption. It is important to note that if a student does **not** meet any of these exemptions, the student is not placed into a remedial mathematics course. The student will be required to take the Accuplacer Math Placement exam. I also agreed to permit a student an opportunity to retest if the student falls within 15 points of passing the placement exam. It was previously only 5 points of passing the placement exam. To help you understand how to interpret this retest information, every student starts the math placement exam with a score of 20 (not zero) and needs to achieve only 45 points out of 100 to reach the minimum cutoff score of 65. In closing, it is imperative that I reiterate again - at the Developmental Education Committee meeting, when the final vote was taken every academic department representative and the student representative voted for the Math Sub-Committee's recommendations!

Prof. Frank Frisenda, Vice President NCCFT, remarks as presented:

So I just want to say that it's irrevocable retirement. I went to human resources at 4:35 last Monday to hand in my resignation, and they wouldn't accept it because it was late. So now I'm going to be here for 5 more years. So this is just I'm just writing. So it's a stream of consciousness. So anytime you want to yell at me, go right ahead. So it was really funny the difference in your attitude between when you're trying to find a consensus for a new chair versus a consensus with the senate and administration.

The following discussion took place:

Trustee Cornachio: Because they're wrong Frank. When you get everything in the Board united on something, we fight on everything else. On this one, we're united. Doesn't that tell you something?

Prof. Frisenda: It absolutely does. So in one breath you say we're the experts, and yet when you do not agree with one or two administrators or a board member, you yield to them. You didn't consider any of Professor DeSanto's data. As a matter of fact, speaking on the subcommittee meeting, you looked at the deans and said, "Look, they're shaking their heads," which is a lot more data, I guess, than Dr. DeSanto had. But speaking of them-- Speaking, we have a lot of acting administrators. Okay? We have an acting president. We have well, interim, I know. We changed the titles. We have acting deans. We have acting vice presidents. The thing is, I think that the term acting or interim seems to apply a short period, and something's going to happen. Okay? And it seems that, I'm on the Dean Search Committee. Okay? About several years ago, we had a search, and we couldn't find enough candidates to submit. So they said, "We're going to reopen the search," and we were almost delayed for that to happen.

Dr. Gardyn: Frank, which dean was that?

Prof. Frisenda: The dean of math and science. Oh, math and science. Okay. Anyway, by tonight's action, with respect to the multiple measures, etcetera, you've established a whole new paradigm on the meaning of shared governance. We now have a consensus statement versus a college statement, whereby the terms senate and



administration seem to be used as mutually exclusive of each other. This is going to create a scorched earth policy here. Your message is crystal clear. And although we've been reduced by 105 full-time lines, the rest of us are still here.

Trustee Cornachio: We didn't do that, Frank. They retired. We gave them a buyout, and they took it. They retired. We didn't reduce.

Prof. Frisenda: Well, let's see. I have heard the term, and we're going to hear it again all right sizing - right sizing.

Prof. Frisenda: And I want to see if that term comes up. We'll see if it comes up again. If this is going to cost \$13 million for these retirees, and we don't know what to do about it, because I've got to borrow from NIFA, or we've got to do this, or we don't know how to pay it back, if the 105 people stayed here, \$120,000 a year with benefits, which is what the college uses, that's \$13 million too. How were you going to pay for this if everybody just stayed maybe everybody should pull back their retirement letters, and we'll spend the \$13 million--

Dr. Gardyn: One-third of that cost was the incentive payout.

Prof. Frisenda: But the thing is, if we stayed here, it would still cost you \$13 million in salaries and benefits. 105 times \$120,000--

Dr. Gardyn: No, it was \$13 million. It was going to cost about \$7 to \$8 million.

Prof. Frisenda: Oh, so it's a bargain, us retiring. The problem I'm having is that we have more administrators than ever before. You want to give them raises. Yet, you're not holding their feet to the fire. Okay? Maybe what you should do when these administrators leave is hire more adjunct administrators.

Chair Gardyn announced the next Capital and Finance BOT Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 8, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. followed by the Full Board meeting. The Board will open the public session between 6:15 and 6:30 p.m. and resume the public session approximately 7:30 p.m.

Chair Gardyn requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Trustee Drucker moved the motion; seconded by Trustee DeGrace. Motion carried 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Drucker  
Secretary

## *Consensus Statement respecting placement testing for Reading and English*

The Academic Senate and the Administration jointly recommend that the following multiple measures will exempt students from the Writing Placement Exam, and that those students will be placed in ENG 101:

NYS English Language Arts Regents score of 85+, within four years of application; OR, 540+ on the SAT Writing Exam; OR 23+ on the ACT English section; OR 3+ on the AP Exam in English Literature and Composition or English Language and Composition; OR International Baccalaureate Exam in English score of 4+.

In addition, students who score 79-84 on the NYS English Language Arts Regents and who do NOT have non-credit Reading placement shall be exempt from the Writing Placement exam and placed into ENG 100.

The Academic Senate and the Administration also jointly recommend that the following multiple measures exempt students from the Reading portion of the placement examination:

An SAT Critical Reading Score of 500+ OR an ACT Reading Score of 21+ *IN CONJUNCTION WITH* A New York State English Language Arts (Common Core) Regents Score of 82+; OR, the following single measures: AP Exam in English Literature and Composition or English Language and Composition of 3+; OR International Baccalaureate Exam in English score of 4+; OR SAT Critical Reading score of 540+; OR ACT Reading Score of 23+.

*College Statement respecting placement testing for Mathematics*

ONE of the following will exempt a student from the Accuplacer test in Math:

A score of 80 or better on the Integrated Algebra Regents,

OR,

a SAT Math score of 500 or better;

OR

an ACT Math score of 21 or above;

OR

A score of 3 or better on the AP Calculus exam.

DRAFT