Queensborough Community College Academic Senate Committee on Bylaws
Minutes of the March 10, 2010 Meeting

Committee Members Present: Dr. David Sarno, Chair, Dr. Janice Molloy, Dr. Jonathan Cornick (arrived at 12 pm), Dr. Joseph Goldenberg, Ms. Liza Larios, Dr. Christine Mooney, Secretary.

Quorum present: Yes.

The minutes of the Fall 2009 meeting conducted via the email system were submitted for approval. A motion was made to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded and accepted. The minutes of the meeting were accepted by the committee.

Dr. Sarno convened the meeting by asking members to review the agenda provided to committee members the previous week. The agenda was reviewed. A motion was made to accept the agenda as proposed. The agenda was accepted by the committee.

The meeting began with an update from Dr.Sarno, the committee chair. Dr. Sarno informed the committee about his communications with Dr. Perel and Dr. Tai. Dr. Sarno provided the committee with information about the current proposals and new business. Dr. Sarno informed the committee that there was a great deal of matters before our committee this semester.

Dr. Sarno then began a discussion about the proposal from the Committee on the Gallery and Performing Arts. A discussion was held about the revised proposal received by the committee. Several questions were raised about the proposed opening paragraph of the proposal. After a discussion the following proposed changes were made:

To: The Committee on Cultural and Archival Resources shall consist of ten members. The seven (7) voting members of the committee shall be: five (5) members of the instructional staff; two (2) students. The nonvoting members of the committee shall be the Director of the QCC Art Gallery, the Director of the Queensborough Performing Arts Center (QPAC), and the Director of the Kupferberg Holocaust Resource Center & Archives, all of whom shall contribute as nonvoting members. In the event of a tie vote, the director(s) of institution shall have a vote on matters pertaining to their area of concern.

A further discussion was held by the committee members about proposed changes from the Fall of 2009. In the Fall of 2009, Dr. Sarno responded to Dr. Perel about the committee's concern regarding paragraph a. The committee accepted paragraph with the following change:

To: Serve as a liaison between the QCC Art Gallery, Queensborough Performing Arts Center (QPAC) and Kupferberg Holocaust Resource Center & Archives and the campus community.

A further discussion was raised regarding item c. The committee agreed that the language of c was vague and did not address to whom the recommended involvement was directed.

Dr. Sarno indicated that he would speak with Dr. Perel regarding the committee's intent. A motion was made to approve the proposal as submitted, with the changes indicated above, and pending further explanation on item c. The motion was seconded. The proposal was accepted.

The next agenda item before the committee was from the Committee on Distance Education. The proposal was submitted by Dr. Edward Volchok on behalf of the committee. The request was made to increase the size of the committee from five members to seven members. This request was predicated on the increased workload of this committee over the past year.

A discussion was held by the committee and a motion was made to accept the proposal as submitted. The motion was seconded. The proposal was accepted as submitted.

Dr. Sarno presented the next agenda item from the Steering Committee of the Academic Senate. The Steering Committee submitted a proposal to include an amendment to the bylaws on the use of email for committee business.

A discussion was held amongst the committee members about the preference for in person meetings. However, there are times when it is absolutely necessary for committee business to be conducted through email. The matter before the committee dealt with the appropriate language to handle email communications by committees of the Academic Senate.

Dr. Sarno provided the committee with information from Dr. Tai about the intentions of the Steering Committee as it related to email communications. A discussion was held to review the proposal and the following changes were made:

4. In-person meetings of committee members are the optimal way to transact business, evaluate proposals and resolutions, and conduct votes concerning such resolutions in committees of the Academic Senate. ***Where it is absolutely necessary and should it be the judgment of the committee chair to conduct the committee's business electronically, the work of committees of the Academic Senate may nevertheless be transacted electronically within the following specifications:***
   a. ***The meeting shall be announced in the same manner as the in person meeting.*** All materials, proposals, and actions relevant to committee purview may be submitted electronically for the review of committee members and circulated for committee comment for a demarcated period of time to be determined by the committee chair with the consent of committee members.
   b. Should it be the judgment of the Committee chair and its membership that it is absolutely necessary to conduct an electronic vote upon a resolution arising from the circulation of these materials and subsequent to circulation and

opportunity for discussion of aforementioned materials and any correspondence they may elicit, the vote will be taken in the following manner:

1. The Resolution in question will be circulated among all committee members by e-mail, with an indication that an affirmative, negative, or abstaining vote must be returned, via reply e-mail, by a set date and time;
2. Replies will then be collected and printed out by the committee chair;
3. The results of the vote will be announced to the committee members electronically;
4. Said results, and any resolution approved by the vote, shall be reported to the Academic Senate by the Committee's chair and/or secretary in the same manner as when votes are conducted in-person.
5. The e-mails containing the votes will be retained by the Committee chair or secretary for delivery to the Senate archivist at the close of the Academic year in the same manner as when votes are conducted in-person.

c. *The Secretary of the committee shall prepare minutes of the meeting summarizing the committee work that was conducted electronically. The minutes should be provided to each committee member for their approval. The minutes of the electronic proceedings and accompanying emails shall be distributed in the same manner as for in person meetings.*

d. **The e-mails containing the resolution, comments, votes and approved minutes shall be made available to any member of the public community upon request as per New York State law governing open meetings.**

A motion was made to accept the proposal with the above indicated changes. The motion was seconded and approved. The committee also agreed that the following recommendations would be made to the Steering Committee for appropriate action. These recommendations came as a result of a lengthy discussion about conducting committee business via email.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. A formal recommendation is to be made to the Steering Committee of the Academic Senate that the Committee on Computer Resources be directed to consider alternatives for compiling and recording committee business conducted via email. This recommendation came from the committee's discussion about the cumbersome threads and repetition that comes from a reply to all discussion over email.
2. The committee expressed concern about the use of email for committee meetings. Therefore, a recommendation was made and accepted by the committee, that the Steering Committee report to the Academic Senate at the conclusion of each semester's meeting as to the following:
a. The number of committee's who have conducted business during that semester via electronic means.

b. The compliance of the committee's conducting electronic meetings with the afore mentioned guidelines.
c. That the use of electronic communications be monitored by the Steering Committee and if necessary, the committee address any concerns with a particular committee.

A motion was made to accept the proposal of the steering committee with the above recommended changes. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Sarno then directed the committee to new business. The new business before the committee is the creation of a new committee of the Academic Senate. The committee read a proposal for the creation of a committee on Assessment. Dr. Sarno provided background to the committee on the Task Force on Assessment. Ms. Larios provided the committee with information on the discussion held the previous day at the Academic Senate meeting.

Dr. Sarno expressed to the committee the urgency of this matter due to the Middle States Review and need for immediate action. The committee was given a copy of the proposal and each member read the proposal. A discussion was held about the membership of the committee, the role of the committee versus the administrative Office of Assessment. Questions were also raised about the membership of departments on the committee. A number of questions also arose about the exact charge of the committee and its role in the overall assessment scheme. The following are specific questions that were raised by the committee during the discussion:

1. What is not the role of the assessment committee?
2. How will the membership of the committee be determined by the Committee on Committees?
3. How will the assessment committee interact with and communicate with the Office of Assessment?
4. Will the committee be responsible for archiving and storing assessment data?
5. How does the committee relate to departmental assessment committees that may already exist?
6. What does the rationale mean by the use of recommendation regarding assessment?
7. What does it mean to close the loop?
8. Will the members of this committee have differing expectations then members of other committees? For example, release time.

A suggestion was made to table the discussion due to the time and the fact that the committee members had not had a chance to read the proposal prior to the meeting to allow for a better understanding of the proposal. An motion was made to table the matter and resume discussion at the next meeting. The motion was seconded and approved. A meeting was scheduled for March 17th at 11 am. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Mooney, Secretary
Bylaws Committee of the Academic Senate

.