

To: Members of the College Council and College Community
Date: April 1, 2026
From: Amanda Kalin, Secretary
Subject: Agenda for the 4/28/26 College Council Meeting @ 3:00 PM U-219

The College Council will meet on Tuesday, April 28, 2026, at 3:00 PM in U-219.

AGENDA

I. Approval of the minutes of the meetings held on March 24, 2026 (posted [HERE](#))

II. Reports

A. Remarks from the Chair of College Council, Daniel Kane

B. President's Remarks

C. Facilities Committee, Informational Item, Tommy Mintz, Committee member

- Informational Item: Update Locked Door Resolution

D. Instructional Committee, Roberto Mariani, Committee member

- Two-Meeting Rule Discussion: Resolution Adoption of Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee Recommendations and Revision of the Faculty Evaluation (SmartEvals) Student Survey (**See Attachment A**)

E. Legislative Committee, Shoshana Friedman, Chair

- Two-Meeting Rule Discussion: Constitution Resolutions (**See Attachment B**)

F. Shared Governance, Matthew Gartner, Chair

- Informational Item: Procedural Guide

G. PSC CUNY's Immigrant Solidarity Working Group, presented by Robert Cowan
(**See Attachment C**)

III. New Business

IV. Events/Announcements

COLLEGE COUNCIL CALENDAR 2025-2026

- Tuesday, April 28, 2026 @ 3:00 PM in U-219
- Tuesday, June 2, 2026 @ 3:00 PM in U-219

Instruction Committee – Spring 2026

College Council Resolution (Plain-Language Summary Version)

What this resolution does:

This resolution asks the College Council to formally adopt the recommendations made by the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee, which worked during the 2024–2025 academic year to improve the Faculty Evaluation (SmartEvals) system.

Why this matters:

Student response rates to faculty evaluations have dropped to levels too low to be useful for teaching improvement, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The committee reviewed the current evaluation questions, aligned them with peer observation standards and Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements, and proposed strategies to improve student participation.

What happens next if this passes:

- The revised SmartEvals student survey questions will be adopted.
- The College will move forward as soon as possible with implementing these changes.
- Relevant offices (Instructional Committee, Academic Affairs, IT, IR) will be directed to coordinate implementation and pilot improvements to response rates.

This plain-language summary was drafted with the assistance of generative artificial intelligence. All content was reviewed, edited, and approved by the author to ensure accuracy, alignment with institutional policy, and compliance with shared governance procedures.

College Council Resolution (Formal Version)

Kingsborough Community College

College Council Resolution

Title: Adoption of Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee Recommendations and Revision of the Faculty Evaluation (SmartEvals) Student Survey

Whereas, Kingsborough Community College has utilized the SmartEvals platform for faculty course evaluations since Fall 2021, during which time student response rates have declined significantly, reaching approximately 15% in Spring 2024—well below the threshold required for evaluation data to be considered meaningful for instructional improvement and personnel actions; and

Whereas, the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee was formally convened during Academic Year 2024–2025 to examine the faculty evaluation process, with a charge to improve student participation, enhance the

quality and clarity of evaluation questions, and ensure alignment with institutional policies and best practices; and

Whereas, the Committee conducted a comprehensive review of the existing SmartEvals instrument, examined data trends, evaluated alignment with the Peer Observation of Teaching Report, and incorporated considerations related to Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI), resulting in a set of revised evaluation questions and strategic recommendations; and

Whereas, the Committee's work reflects broad faculty and administrative representation and was guided by principles of inclusivity, evidence-based assessment, and continuous improvement in teaching and learning; and

Whereas, the Committee's final report, submitted in Fall 2025, recommends adopting revised faculty-focused evaluation questions, reconsidering the placement and purpose of student-focused withdrawal questions, and pursuing institution-wide strategies to increase student response rates, including integration with existing digital learning platforms;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Kingsborough Community College College Council hereby **adopts the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee (Academic Year 2024–2025)** as outlined in its final report; and

Be it further resolved, that the College Council approves the revision of the **Faculty Evaluation (SmartEvals) student survey questions**, which are completed by students and are distinct from the Peer Observation of Teaching process, in accordance with the Committee's recommendations; and that these revisions ensure the student survey focuses on student perspectives on instruction while remaining *conceptually aligned*—but procedurally separate—from the Peer Observation of Teaching framework and compliant with Regular and Substantive Interaction requirements; and

Be it further resolved, that the College Council directs the **Instructional Committee**, in collaboration with **Academic Affairs, Information Technology, Institutional Research, and other relevant stakeholders**, to proceed with implementation of the revised survey **as soon as possible**, including any necessary technical updates, communication to faculty and students, and pilot strategies to improve response rates; and

Be it finally resolved, that the College Council affirms its commitment to a faculty evaluation system that is pedagogically meaningful, equitable, transparent, and capable of supporting instructional improvement as well as reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes.

This resolution was drafted with the assistance of generative artificial intelligence. All content was reviewed, edited, and approved by the author to ensure accuracy, alignment with institutional policy, and compliance with shared governance procedures.

Kingsborough Community College
Faculty Evaluations Advisory Report

11/6/2025

Committee Members:

Chairperson: Cynthia Olvina

Members: Amanda Kalin
Charles Swift
Daniel Kane
Dorina Tila
Gordon Alley-Young
Ivan Ho
Juan Franquiz
Judith Cohen
Kevin Duffy
Laura Landau
Megan O'Neill
Roberto Mariani
Stuart Parker

Introduction

The following report outlines the work established by the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee at Kingsborough Community College. Since the implementation of the SmartEvals platform in Fall 2021, the college has faced persistently low student response rates, culminating in a historic low of 15% during Spring 2024. These numbers fall significantly short of the 60% threshold generally required for evaluation data to be considered actionable by department chairs and faculty for purposes of reappointment, promotion, and tenure. In response, Cynthia Olvina submitted a proposal which recommended the formation of a dedicated advisory committee charged with identifying and implementing strategies to enhance student participation, improve the effectiveness of course evaluations, and ensure the SmartEvals platform is being used to its full potential.

Purpose and Charge of the Committee

Establishing the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee represents a proactive and strategic effort by the college to revitalize and strengthen the course evaluation process. This initiative reflects a commitment to fostering thoughtful collaboration, data-informed decision making, and continuous improvement in teaching and learning at Kingsborough.

The primary objective of the Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee is to develop a report to be shared with the College Council Instructional Committee. The committee's goal is to recommend strategies that both increase student response rates and enhance the quality and usefulness of feedback received.

The committee focused on:

- Reviewing the current evaluation structure and existing data trends
- Assessing and recommending revisions to evaluation questions to ensure clarity, relevance and impact
- Developing strategic marketing and communication plans to increase student engagement
- Exploring rewards and incentive systems to encourage participation from both students and faculty

These efforts aim to align the SmartEvals system more closely with the college's institutional goals. By improving the design and implementation of faculty evaluations, the system can become a more valuable tool for both pedagogical improvement and personnel decisions. All while giving students the opportunity to share their perspectives.

Composition and Inclusivity

The diverse committee included faculty and staff throughout the college community. This inclusive approach is designed to foster meaningful collaboration and produce well-rounded, actionable recommendations.

Committee Members (14)

- **Chair** – Cynthia Olvina
- **Members** – Amanda Kalin, Charles Swift, Daniel Kane, Dorina Tila, Gordon Alley-Young, Ivan Ho, Juan Franquiz, Judith Cohen, Kevin Duffy, Laura Landau, Megan O'Neill, Roberto Mariani, and Stuart Parker

The committee was divided into two subgroups. Subgroup one focused on assessing questions. Subgroup two focused on increasing response rates.

Timeline

The committee was formed in Fall 2024. The committee held multiple meetings between Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 with a final report due in Fall 2025 to be submitted to the Chair of the Instructional Committee on the College Council.

Past and Current Faculty Evaluation Process

In the past, anonymous faculty evaluations were completed in a paper format, given to students and completed in class while the faculty members waited outside the classroom. The office of Information Technology collected the results and provided chairpersons with their department's faculty evaluation results. Current evaluations are completed on an evaluation software called SmartEvals. The evaluations are mass distributed to students electronically either through a website, text, or on Navigate. Evaluations are anonymous. Faculty members can see the percentage of completed evaluations in real time. Administration, Chairpersons and faculty are provided results after the evaluation period closes. The evaluation period is approximately a month long at the end of the Fall and Spring semesters. Response rates are significantly lower now compared to the previous processes.

Expected Outcomes

The committee's success will be measured through:

- A substantial increase in course response rates, targeting the 60% benchmark
- Improved clarity and relevance of evaluation questions
- Enhanced student and faculty satisfaction with the evaluation process
- Stronger alignment between evaluation data and institutional needs related to teaching quality, reappointment, promotion, and tenure

These changes aim to maximize the value of the college's investment in SmartEvals, create a more responsive and inclusive feedback culture, and support evidence-based decision-making across the institution.

Subgroups

To support a more focused and in-depth examination of key aspects of the faculty evaluation process, two subcommittees were established. Each tasked with addressing one of the following areas: Evaluation Questions and Response Rates. Each subcommittee received specific charges outlining its area of focus. Each subgroup was expected to meet, engage in discussions and develop recommendations to be documented into the final report.

Subgroup Faculty Evaluation Questions – Members and Charges

Members: Amanda Kalin (Subgroup Chair), Judith Cohen, Dorina Tila, Ivan Ho, Stuart Parker, Cynthia Olvina and Charles Swift

CHARGES:

Draft New or Revised Questions

Review the current question sets to assist with drafting new questions. In addition, draft two or three RSI questions. Evaluate how to incorporate or emphasize the RSI policy, ensuring that they assess the quality and frequency of interaction between faculty and students. Consider notes provided from the breakout room for discussion, as these may provide valuable context when updating questions.

Share Report:

Present the group's process and the drafted questions to the committee. Explain how these questions are designed to assess the quality and frequency of interaction between faculty and students, ensuring that evaluations provide actionable feedback for continuous improvement. Discuss how these questions align with KCC's policies, particularly in terms of Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI). and explain how the questions will yield meaningful results that benefit both the instructor and the students.

Faculty Evaluation Subgroup Report – Faculty Evaluation Questions

The group reviewed the 12 questions included on the SmartEval system. The group discussion included questioning the focus/goal of these questions. It was determined that these questions should be *instructor evaluation based* and should align with the *Peer Observation of Teaching Report*. Additionally, discussion of

how best to incorporate Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) into the existing or revised questions or inclusion of additional questions that address RSI was required. Question structure and goal of particular questions was initially discussed.

Students who have withdrawn from the class are presented with a set of seven questions, which have a very different focus when compared with the 12 questions presented to students who remained. The 12 SmartEval questions were aligned with the *Peer Observation of Teaching Report*. The *Summary Table* that includes this alignment is included in this report. The Subgroup met to review the questions, their alignment to the *Peer Observation of Teaching Report*, and incorporation of addressing RSI.

Eight of the 12 questions were revised as a means of clarifying the intent of the question, prevent duplication, and/or to incorporate RSI. One question was deleted as it was determined that the question was repetitive, leaving a total of 11 questions on the SmartEval. RSI is embedded within four of the 11 questions (36%). The included *Summary Table* depicts the process and includes the original questions, recommended updates to the questions, alignment with the *Peer Observation of Teaching Report*, alignment with RSI requirements, and notes to explain the process and decision.

The seven questions presented to students who withdrew from the course were discussed. The subgroup came up with the following conclusions/recommendations:

- The goal of these questions needs to be understood as they are “Student-Focused” rather than “Faculty-Focused.”
- Investigation as to whether these questions should be removed from the SmartEval platform and included in a survey sent to the student at the time the student withdraws from the course. This may yield a higher return rate as opposed to being sent as part of the SmartEval process, where a student may not partake in the SmartEval as they are not currently enrolled in the course or there was a significant time lapse between course withdrawal and opening of the SmartEval system.
- Given that these questions remain “Student-Focused,” it is recommended to work with College stakeholders whose work focuses on retention and equity gaps, student satisfaction, and the student experience. Alignment with the 2025-2030 Strategic Plan – Retention and Equity Group may be helpful in discussions of purpose, revision, and next steps.

The work of the Subgroup was presented to the Committee for discussion and feedback and was shared with the Committee for further feedback. During our last meeting, guest John Acosta and Chair of the Instructional Committee for the 2025-2026 College Council Term, provided a recommendation concerning clarification of “online” learning versus “distance” learning under the questions presented to students who withdrew from the course (see questions #6).

The Summary Table outlining the work completed by the Faculty Evaluation Questions Subgroup is provided in the Appendix.

Subgroup Response Rates – Members and Charges

Members: Kevin Duffy (Subgroup Chair), Juan Franquiz, Megan O’Neill, Roberto Mariani, Laura Landau, Gordon Alley-Young and Daniel Kane

CHARGES:

Develop strategies to increase response rates for evaluations by considering input from the breakout room for discussion, which may provide valuable context. Additionally, create approaches to encourage faculty buy-in and help them effectively promote the importance of evaluations to students, emphasizing the benefits for both students and instructors in the process.

Share Report:

Present the group's process and proposed strategies to the committee. Discuss how these strategies specifically aim to engage both faculty and students, emphasizing the importance of evaluations and the role they play in enhancing the overall learning experience. Highlight the various tactics designed to encourage faculty buy-in. Explain how these strategies will help foster a culture of feedback and continuous improvement across the institution.

Faculty Evaluation Subgroup Report – Improving Response Rates

The committee discussed ways to improve response rates for course evaluations, including identifying barriers to this task. Barriers identified were twofold: faculty barriers and student barriers.

Identified Barriers: Faculty

Incentive: What is being evaluated? Course or faculty. Lack of clarity does not motivate faculty to participate, nor does it provide an incentive to encourage students to participate.

If faculty - for what purpose? What is the incentive? Are students qualified to evaluate the expertise of faculty?

If course - for what purpose? Are we asking the correct questions? Are these questions meeting faculty needs?

Proposed Solution: Work with faculty on creating questions they would like to receive feedback on, and evaluate the current questions being asked, creating a culture of assessment and modeling. Work with IT & IR to develop resources to support this culture, one that emphasizes the importance of self-assessment. Ensure questions accomplish the following goals:

- Does the course provide transferable skills?
- Ensure no cultural biases in wording
- Ensure questions are aligned with SLOs

Timing for evaluations is arbitrary and cumbersome. If the course is being evaluated, are we getting a clear picture of what can be improved in a timely manner? Are students qualified to "evaluate" a course/teaching methodology/etc.?

Proposed Solution: If evaluation occurs mid-semester, data must be provided to faculty in a timely manner so that data can be used productively. Create guidelines for instructors to help create this culture and a blueprint to help meet the students where they are. Ensure faculty are aware of where this evaluation lives (Brightspace - see below) and provide training on the process and how to interpret data.

Identified Barriers: Students

Without clarity on how the data will be used, students are less likely to participate in surveys.

If faculty are not motivated to stress the importance of this data, students are not aware of the evaluation.

Proposed Solution: Going back to the old paper & pencil method will not work for online courses. We suggest evaluation be uploaded into every Brightspace course shell by IT, with deadline on this "assignment".

Assignment can count as an extra credit, although concerns towards academic and grading integrity were brought up. However, faculty must first design and approve questions before being uploaded.

Using Brightspace as the repository can allow for ease of dissemination, analysis/interpretation, and reaches all students where they are regardless of modality.

Proposed Solution: Pilot intervention. While we agree the current system could be improved, we would like to have a team work with IR/Admin to truly drill down into this process, identify the most appropriate and meaningful questions, and determine what this data will ultimately be used for. Additionally, identify current processes used successfully by other institutions (i.e., Baruch College) and determine if we can copy their processes and protocols. The use of Brightspace seems like a logical home for this assessment to reside since students and faculty use this for all courses.

Conclusion

The Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee has undertaken a comprehensive review of the faculty evaluation process with the goal of improving both the quality of evaluation data and the level of student participation. Through the work of its two subgroups, Faculty Evaluation Questions and Response Rates, the committee developed recommendations that promote greater alignment between SmartEvals, the Peer Observation of Teaching Report, and Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements. The committee's proposed revisions to the evaluation questions aim to enhance clarity, eliminate redundancy, and ensure that the feedback collected provides meaningful insights for both instructional improvement and critical personnel decisions. In parallel, the strategies identified to address response rates emphasize the need for clear, consistent communication, greater faculty engagement in promoting the process, and integration of the evaluation process into digital platforms already familiar to students. Collectively, these efforts strongly support the college's commitment to evidence-based assessment, foster a culture of continuous improvement in teaching and learning, and establish a more reliable and effective faculty evaluation system for the entire campus community. The committee respectfully submits this report and its proposed recommendations to the College Council Instructional Committee for full review and consideration of future implementation.

APPENDIX

Summary Table – Faculty Evaluation Questions

<u>Original Student Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Updated Student Evaluation Questions</u>	<u>Peer Observation Form</u>	<u>Notes</u>
1. The instructor held my interest throughout the course.	1. The instructor used multiple techniques to keep me engaged throughout the course.	Instructor Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Changed - interest to attention • Recent change – combined Question #1 and #12 • Meets RSI
2. The instructor communicated in a way that I understood.	2. The instructor communicated the course content in a way that I understood.	Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change focused on course content
3. The instructor increased my knowledge of the subject matter.	3. The instructor helped me learn more about the topic than I knew when starting the class.	Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial change – included course subject and deletion of matter • Goal to get across that the student should be different at exit from the class. Modification addresses. • Wanted ESL friendly (universally friendly) verbiage
4. The instructor presented material in an organized manner throughout the course.	4. The instructor presented material in a clear and organized manner throughout the course.	Instructional Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included “clear” • Meets RSI
5. The instructor treated me with courtesy and respect throughout the course.	No Change	Instructor Communication Skills and Management of Learning Environment	
6. The instructor was available to me for discussions throughout the course.	6. The instructor was regularly available during office hours and made time for additional discussions if I needed.	Management of Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanded and clarified the question • Meets RSI
7. The instructor encouraged me to ask questions and participate throughout the course.	No Change	Instructional Strategies	

Original Student Evaluation Questions	Updated Student Evaluation Questions	Peer Observation Form	Notes
8. The instructor kept me informed about my academic progress throughout the course.	No Change	Management of Learning Environment	
9. The instructor maintained a good atmosphere for learning throughout the course.	9. The instructor maintained a positive learning environment throughout the course.	Management of Learning Environment and Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial question about what “atmosphere” meant – changed to environment Felt positive was less subjective than good
10. Assignments and exams were related to course content.	10. Assignments and exams were clearly related to course content.	Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified by including clearly
11. The instructor clearly explained how I would be evaluated throughout the course	11. The instructor clearly explained how I would be evaluated and provided regular feedback throughout the course.	Management of Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We wanted to include a question that related to feedback – originally thought to expand Question #8, but felt it more appropriate here. Meets RSI
12. The instructor was an effective teacher throughout the course.	Deleted	Instructional Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial review felt this question was vague Upon recent review – we felt this question was repetitive (see Question #1) and deleted it.
	12. The instructor provided opportunities for interaction with my classmates	Fostering Student Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added question to as there seemed to be no question that addressed interaction with classmates. Applies to all modalities of course offering <p>Based on feedback from 4/25 Meeting this question was deleted as there is no requirement for a course to have this type of participation</p>

List of Questions if the student dropped the course:

1. What was the primary reason you dropped the course?
 - a. Course related issue
 - b. Instructor related issue
 - c. Financial issue
 - d. Scheduling or time commitment issue
 - e. Personal issue
 - f. Other

2. The overall teaching ability of the instructor was good (skip this question if you do not feel that you can answer it fairly)
 - a. Strongly Agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Disagree
 - e. Strongly Disagree

3. Did you speak to an academic advisor before you dropped the course?
 - a. Yes/No

4. When you registered for the course, did you think that there was a good chance you might drop it at a later date?
 - a. Yes/No

5. Was it a distance learning online course?
 - a. Yes/No

6. Would you prefer to take the course with a different instructor?
 - a. Yes/No

7. Did you review the class syllabus before dropping the class?
 - a. Yes/No

Recommendations:

- The goal of these questions needs to be understood as they are “Student” focused rather than “Faculty” focused.
- Share with the following for feedback/alignment:
 - 2025-2030 Strategic Planning Committee – Retention and Equity Group
 - College Stakeholder Committee (AA)
- Investigate if these questions need to be **removed** from the SmartEval platform and **included** in a survey that is sent at the time the student drops the course.
- Once the above are addressed, the Subgroup can move on to evaluate/modify the questions and their structure.

John Acosta noted the change to “online course” and removal of “distance learning” for clarification of modality.

Attachment B – Legislative Committee – Constitution Resolutions

The Legislative Committee presents the following resolutions to amend the constitution by vote of College Council:

WHEREAS several changes to membership have been voted on by Council;

WHEREAS the constitution should accurately reflect the will of the Council;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the following changes be made to the College Council Constitution:

- a. In Article II: (4/29/25)
 - i. ~~One~~ **Two** department delegate from each instructional department
 - ii. ~~Two~~ **Three** part-time instructional staff delegates-at-large
 - iii. ~~Three~~ **Seven** delegates-at-large from the HEO and CLT series
 - iv. ~~Two~~ **Three** delegates elected by the full-time regularly appointed non-probationary supporting staff
 - v. **UFS senators who opt to serve as members of College Council**
- b. Article III, Section II, iii); (11/18/25) **Nominations for delegates-at-large must be conducted by secret ballot. Nominees must affirmatively accept the nomination before preparation of the final ballot.** ~~Nominations for delegates-at-large must be conducted by secret ballot provided that nominees must have the opportunity to decline nomination before preparation of the final ballot.~~
- c. Article III, Section II, v):(Per Cuny Bylaws): Persons who have tendered their resignation or who have received notice of non-reappointment must not be eligible to vote, or be nominated or elected to office. **Faculty on Travia leave are not eligible to vote.**
- d. Article III, Section III, iii):(11/18/25): Elections for department delegates must be conducted by secret ballot. Mail and/or electronic ballots must not be used. **All nominators and nominees must be present.**
- e. Article III, Section IV, (4/29/25) ii) **Three (3) Part-Time Instructional Staff Delegates-at-large** iii) **Seven (7) HEO and CLT Delegates-at-large,** iv) **Three (3) Support Staff Delegates-at-large**

WHEREAS the actual electorate of various elections are represented ambiguously in the text of the constitution;

WHEREAS clarifying the language of the constitution is a goal of the legislative committee

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the following three changes be made to the College Council Constitution:

- a. Article III, Section IV, i): must be elected by members of the full-time ~~instructional~~ staff, **which includes all full time faculty, all full time HEO series employees, all full time CLT series employees, and all ECP employees.** ~~faculty status or, who have received notification of reappointment for the third or succeeding years of full-time service.~~
- b. Article III, Section IV, ii): must be elected by members of the part-time instructional staff (“Adjunct faculty”). All current adjunct faculty, **which includes adjunct faculty and adjunct CLT series employees,**
- c. Article III, Section IV, iii): must be elected by eligible voters including all Higher Education Officer series and **full time CLT series employees**

WHEREAS the number of delegates at large have been equal to the number of academic departments;

WHEREAS the number of academic departments have fluctuated over time;

WHEREAS the title of Senior Lecturer has been added to the most recent labor contract:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the following three changes be made to the College Council Constitution:

- f. Article II, iv.: **Fifteen (15)** Full-time instructional staff delegates-at-large. ~~equal to the number of departments~~
- g. Article III, Section IV,i): **Fifteen (15) Full-Time Instructional Staff Delegates-at-large (equal to the number of instructional departments)**
- h. Article III, Section III, iv: Persons holding the rank of Lecturer **or Senior Lecturer**

1.

2. ARTICLE II: COMPOSITION OF COLLEGE COUNCIL

The College Council must be composed of

- i. The President of the College
- ii. The Chief Academic Officer of the College
- iii. The Chief Administrative Officer of the College
- iv. The Registrar
- v. The Chairperson of each instructional department
- vi. ~~One~~ **Two** department delegate from each instructional department
- vii. ~~equal to the number of departments~~ **Fifteen** Full-time instructional staff delegates-at-large.
- viii. ~~Two~~ **Three** part-time instructional staff delegates-at-large
- ix. ~~Three~~ **Seven** delegates-at-large from the HEO and CLT series
- x. One alumni delegate
- xi. ~~Two~~ **Three** delegates elected by the full-time regularly appointed non-probationary supporting staff
- xii. Twenty student delegates
- xiii. **UFS senators who opt to serve as members of College Council**
- xiv. One non-voting delegate-at-large seat to be designated for Emeritus/Emerita Teaching Faculty

3. ARTICLE III: ELECTIONS OF DELEGATES TO COLLEGE COUNCIL

a. SECTION I: ELECTIONS

- i. All elections must be supervised by the Legislative Committee. This must also apply to faculty voting under Article III, Section III.

b. SECTION II: ELECTION RULES AND PROCEDURES

- i. The elections for chairperson must be conducted in the first full week of May. These elections must be in person.
- ii. Elections for delegates-at-large must be conducted in May of each year following the elections of department chairpersons and department delegates.
- iii. **Nominations for delegates-at-large must be conducted by secret ballot. Nominees must affirmatively accept the nomination before preparation of the final ballot.** ~~Nominations for delegates-at-large must be conducted by secret ballot provided that nominees must have the opportunity to decline nomination before preparation of the final ballot.~~ Elections for delegates-at-

large must also be conducted by secret ballot. Mail ballots must not be used. Electronic balloting shall be permitted, as determined and administered by the Legislative Committee.

- iv. Persons eligible to vote for delegates-at-large shall be eligible to nominate candidates and be nominated for the position of delegate-at-large.
- v. Persons who have tendered their resignation or who have received notice of non-reappointment must not be eligible to vote, or be nominated or elected to office. **Faculty on Travia leave are not eligible to vote.**
- vi. Eligible voters must be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacant positions to be filled. Election must be by plurality with ties determined by the Chair of College Council.
- vii. For all delegate-at-large seats that become vacant before November 1, vacancies must be filled from the list of unsuccessful candidates of the previous election with the person having the greatest number of votes among the unsuccessful candidates designated to fill the vacancy until the next scheduled election for that seat. Should a special ballot be necessary, it must be held prior to the end of that fall semester to fill the vacancy.
- viii. If a seat becomes vacant after November 1, then it will be filled at the next scheduled election, by special ballot if necessary.
- ix. Where vacancies for unexpired terms are to be filled at a regular election, the candidates receiving the next highest number of votes after filling the regular three-year term vacancies shall be declared elected for the unexpired term. The longer terms shall be assigned to those with the highest number of votes.

c. SECTION III: DEPARTMENT DELEGATES

- i. Department delegates must be elected following the election of department chairpersons by the full-time members of the department having faculty rank or faculty status and must serve a term on the Council equal to that of the department chairpersons. Vacancies must be filled by the Department for the unexpired portion of the term.
- ii. Persons eligible to vote for department delegates must be eligible to nominate candidates and be nominated for the position of department delegate.
- iii. Elections for department delegates must be conducted by secret ballot. Mail and/or electronic ballots must not be used. **All nominators and nominees must be present.**
- iv. Persons holding the rank of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer at the College who have been awarded the Certificate of Continuous Employment must be enfranchised to vote for Department Chairperson and for members of the Department Personnel and Budget Committee.

d. SECTION IV: DELEGATES-AT-LARGE:

- i. Fifteen (15) Full-Time Instructional Staff Delegates-at-large ~~(equal to the number of instructional departments)~~ must be elected by members of the full-time instructional staff, which includes all full time faculty, all full time HEO series employees, all full time CLT series employees, and all ECP employees. ~~faculty status or, who have received notification of reappointment for the third or succeeding years of full-time service.~~ The term of office for these delegates-at-large must be three years, with elections staggered so that approximately one-third must be elected each year. Each person eligible to nominate may cast a secret nominating ballot containing no more than two (2) persons. Those eighteen (18) eligibles who receive the highest number of nominations, plus ties, must appear as candidates on the final ballot.
- ii. Three (3) Part-Time Instructional Staff Delegates-at-large must be elected by members of the part-time instructional staff (“Adjunct faculty”). All current adjunct faculty, which includes adjunct faculty and adjunct CLT series employees, must be eligible to vote for delegates-at-large. However, members of the full-time instructional staff or administrative staff who are concurrently teaching in an adjunct capacity at the college are ineligible to participate in the part-time elections. Part-time faculty serving on a Substitute Full-Time line are eligible to participate in the part-time elections. The term of office for these delegates-at-large must be two years, with elections staggered so that one delegate must be elected each year. Each person eligible to nominate may cast a secret nominating ballot containing no more than one (1) person. Those six (6) eligibles who receive the highest number of nominations, plus ties, must appear as candidates on the final ballot.
- iii. Seven (7) HEO and CLT Delegates-at-large must be elected by eligible voters including all Higher Education Officer series and full time CLT series employees, including Assistant to HEO, HEO Assistant, HEO Associate, HEO, and CLTs; employees on leave serving in Executive Compensation Plan titles must not be eligible. The term of office for these delegates-at-large must be three years, with elections staggered so that one delegate must be elected each year.
- iv. Three (3) Support Staff Delegates-at-large must be elected from the regularly appointed non-probationary supporting staff. The term of office for these delegates-at-large must be three years, with elections staggered so that one delegate must be elected each year for two years, and the third year must have no election. Each person eligible to nominate may cast a secret nominating ballot containing no more than one (1) person. Those six (6) eligible who receive the highest number of nominations, plus ties, must appear as candidates on the final ballot.

e. SECTION V: ALL OTHER DELEGATES:

- i. Eligible student delegates must be elected for one year terms in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the Kingsborough Community College Student Government Association.
- ii. The alumni delegate must be elected by the Alumni Association to serve a term of three years.
- iii. Those elected must be selected on the basis of a plurality vote with ties to be broken by the Chair of College Council. The elections in (i) and (ii) must be conducted by secret ballot. Mail ballots must not be used. Electronic balloting shall be permitted, as determined and administered by the Legislative Committee.
- iv. One non-voting delegate-at-large seat must be designated for Emeritus/Emerita Teaching Faculty. This seat must have a two-year term. Nominees for this seat must be recommended by the President of the College and appointed with the advice and consent of the College Council, with confirmation to be voted upon at the Council meeting in May of that year. All College Council members shall be eligible to vote in this confirmation process.

Appendix C – PSC CUNY’s Immigrant Solidarity Working Group Presentation



Supporting Our Immigrant Students

PSC-CUNY Immigrant Solidarity Working Group

Kingsborough Chapter

College Council • April 28, 2026

PSC ISWG

- In Spring 2025, the PSC establishing the Immigrant Solidarity Working Group (ISWG)
- Focus on immigration courtwatch—to bear witness, comfort respondents, and collect their information to pass on to attorneys and social workers
- The PSC was the first union in NYC to do courtwatch, but after presenting their work to the Municipal Labor Union, other unions have joined the effort
- Since last May, the PSC ISWG has made almost 1,000 discrete visits to the courts

KCC ISWG

- July: I began participating in courtwatch
- October: American Federation of Teachers' Human, Civil, & Women's Rights conference in Detroit
- November: establishment of a KCC chapter of the PSC's Immigrant Solidarity Working Group
- First, research what immigrant student supports already exist on campus, including our ICE protocol
- Second, meet with the President and cabinet to advocate for an Immigrant Student Success Center
- Third, invite Helen Nasser to give UnDocuAlly trainings in departments

This Spring, the KCC ISWG has...

- Attended PSC ISWG meetings to learn what other campuses are doing
- Continued tabling in the breezeway 2-3 days/week to distribute information to students, staff, & faculty
- Continued conversation with the President & Provost about an Immigrant Student Success Center (for which there is now a CUNY-wide campaign)
- Developed an awareness-raising presentation for departments, which was made in Behavioral Sciences, and is available for all departments
- Set up the KCC Faculty/Staff Rapid Response Signal group, in case ICE shows up on campus
- Recruited for ongoing courtwatch support

Summer & Fall Plans

- Work with the new Immigrant Student Success Center (U-228)
- Incorporate more student voices and perspectives into this work
- Make more presentations to academic units
- Develop further materials to share with students, staff, & faculty
- Develop community partnerships in nearby neighborhoods
- Hold an awareness-raising event for the entire community that includes community partners

KCC Resources

New Americans Center

<http://www.kingsborough.edu/nac/Homepage.html>

- Hattie Elmore, Program Director, Hattie.Elmore@kbcc.cuny.edu
- Erick Myssura, Managing Attorney, Erick.Myssura@kbcc.cuny.edu

Immigrant Success Liaisons

- Gavin Ireland, Gavin.Ireland@kbcc.cuny.edu
- Helen Nasser, Helen.Nasser@kbcc.cuny.edu

CUNY Immigration Assistance Program (CIAP) Liaisons

- Students: Althea Maduramente, Althea.Maduramente@kbcc.cuny.edu
- Faculty: Gila Rohr, Gila.Rohr@kbcc.cuny.edu

ICE Protocol & Joining KCC ISWG

KCC ICE Protocol

- https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/campus_security/immigration-enforcement-protocol.html

If ICE is on campus, at the gate, or in the vicinity, contact:

- Ken Greene, Public Safety Chief, Kenneth.Greene@kbcc.cuny.edu
- Beth Douglas, Chief Counsel, Beth.Douglas@kbcc.cuny.edu

KCC ISWG

- Robert Cowan, Campus Lead, robert.cowan9@outlook.com
- To join, contact: kcciswg@gmail.com

CUNY Resources

- CUNY Citizenship Now!

<https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/communications-marketing/citizenship-now/>

- CUNY Office of Undocumented and Immigrant Student Programs

<https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/student-affairs/programs-services/cuny-immigrant-student-success/>

- CUNY Immigration Resources & Information

<https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/communications-marketing/immigrationresourcesandinformation/>

- CUNY Undocumented/Immigrant Students College Resource Guide

https://drive.google.com/file/d/12tyty7guGfBBvTjUTTF7RpHvcUN_hMw0/view

PSC Resources

- Professional Staff Congress (PSC) Immigrant Solidarity Working Group (ISWG)

<https://psc-cuny.org/issues/immigrant-solidarity-working-group/>

- Petition for Immigrant Student Success Centers across CUNY

<https://psc-cuny.org/issues/immigrant-solidarity-working-group/fund-immigrant-student-success-centers-with-full-time-staff/>

- Thandi Farley, PSC-KCC ISWG Liaison, tfarley@psccmail.org

Thank you.



CU NY Immigrant Student Success

CU NY Immigrant Student Success

I AM AN IMMIGRANT