

FCCCC President's Address
CCC Board of Trustee's Meeting
Thursday, March 1, 2012

RECEIVED
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
I

Chairman Wolff, Chancellor Hyman, members of the Board, Officers of the District, faculty, staff and all others present, good morning.

For this report, I'm just going to outline some representative discussions and topics that members of the FC4 and the Executive Committee have examined since the last Board of Trustees meeting. This is not an inclusive report but highlights some of the current debates among the faculty across the district.

First, there has been considerable discussion about the CPS articulations, particularly the dual credit proposals for high school students to acquire college credit in math and English at their respective high schools. Many of us feel that this proposal is problematic and needs clear and systemic oversight. There was some discussion about dual enrollment of high school students in City College's courses and the route of CTE articulations, but these were considered less problematic than the dual credit proposals. We are, therefore, still working on these.

Concomitant with these articulations has been a review of the role and purview of faculty in these articulations, and it was recommended that we ask the local Academic Affairs Committees and Committee A, which have traditionally overseen individual courses and programs -- but have not overseen this kind of articulation agreements -- now to address these articulations. This would be a change, and one we are struggling to embrace.

FC4 and Committee A also have been looking hard at the curriculum process by which various courses move through our internal committees and on to the external committees such as the ICCB, IBHE, and the IAI panels. We are working to make the process transparent to faculty and administrators, to outline in a systematic way the various routes of articulation and accreditation, and to close some gaps that allow curriculum and programs to disappear at certain crucial points. Indeed, we are trying to expand the PAC form to explicate the complexities of the process, and we are proposing, among other things, workshops during Faculty Development Week to address some of these curriculum issues.

We have discussed the proposed tenure procedures with some of the members of the Task Force on Tenure and have focused our emails and discussions on the role of administrators versus faculty, the role of the chairs who know the disciplines well versus the TAP leaders who understand pedagogy, the real differences between the research project and the individualized learning and service plan, the relationship between the TAP leaders and the members of our FC4 subcommittee on tenure. We did agree that the 15-hour graduate course requirement should be abolished, but as to the other issues, it's a work in progress.

Finally we met with Preston Harden and Anne Brennan to discuss the implications, strengths and weaknesses for proposed wrap-around student services and the Grades First roll-out.

The Faculty Council meeting went beyond the allotted two hour meeting time, and I had to postpone discussions on Lumina and other pressing business for the March meeting. As I suggested above, this outline does not include the hundreds of email exchanges and phone calls to discuss policies, processes and priorities.

Respectfully submitted,

Polly Hoover

President of FC4